LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 30 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division BS511
Section .D81

THE BIBLE AND THE AGES

THE BIBLE AND THE AGES

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 30 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

By
HORACE M. DuBOSE, D.D.
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South
Author of
"Crisis of Criticism" "Conciousness of Jesus"; "Life at Its Best"; "Symbol of Methodism"; "History of Methodism"; "Life of Bishop Asbury", etc.

New York Chicago
Fleming H. Revell Company
London and Edinburgh

Copyright, MCMXXX, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

To
Professor Ernst Sellin,
of the University of Berlin,
Scholar, Archæologist and Friend
of the Written Word,
in Grateful Memory of Faithful Friendship
and in Recognition of His Leadership
in Bible Criticism and Research,
this Volume is Affectionately Dedicated.
"Aber des Herrn Wort bleibet in Ewigkeit."

AUTHOR'S NOTE

THE closing section of Chapter VI of this volume, dealing with the problems of Deuteronomy, was originally printed in separate form in *The Methodist Review* (New York). Certain sections of Chapters IV and V also separately appeared some years ago in *The Biblical Review* (New York). Briefer critical and discussional sections of some other chapters have appeared from time to time in such theological publications as *The Methodist Quarterly Review* (Nashville), and *The Essentialist* (Philadelphia). The publishers of these periodicals have kindly consented to their use here. It would have been easy to recast these sections from original notes; but to do so would have been to lose somewhat of the interest and viewpoint of first composition.

H. M. DuB.

Nashville, Tenn.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 11

II. AGE OF CREATION 25

III. ANTEDILUVIAN AGE 51

IV. POSTDILUVIAN AGE 76

V. AGE OF THE PATRIARCHS 97

VI. AGE OF THE LAW 131

VII. NATIONAL AGE OF ISRAEL 165

VIII. AGE OF JUDAISM 197

IX. APOSTOLIC AGE 210

X. AGES OF THE AGES 244

I

INTRODUCTION

THE truth and appositeness of the canonical Scriptures are absolute values of revelation; but mere eulogies passed upon the Book are little to the point of validating its claims or verifying its statements. Reverent, but courageous and painstaking, methods must be employed in Bible study; and especially so since in our day criticism, which is a legitimate science, and Bible interpretation, which is the means of appropriating specific doctrines and teachings, have been plagued by a species of modernism bold in asseveration, and by a type of fundamentalism reckless to the point of presumption. The one, in its effort to unduly appraise the results of science, has betrayed the superior claims of religion; while the other, in mistaken zeal for the letter of religion, has rejected scientific conclusions which are of the nature of Christian evidences.

These extremes of discussion and interpretation do not account wholly for the tenets of the schools sponsoring them. Degrees of soundness are to be found with both; but the student constantly must have in mind the nearness of each extreme. To handle, in any form, the religious literature of today is to meet the phrasings and fallacies of familiar antagonisms. On the one hand, the party cry is insistent for literalism in interpretation; while on the other, scholastic alignment is often arrogant and arbitrary. Conservatism must seek a middle ground for the going of its feet. Its recourse must be to the repositories of testimony; for not only is there found in the oracles of revelation abundant proof of trustworthiness; but the Giver of the oracles Himself has provided a transcript of them at the hands of the ages. Next to the Word itself, this transcript challenges attention. Herein befalls the double quest for truth.

Revelation thus not only makes appeal to its own phenomena; but, likewise, to contemporaneous records and to the certifications of science. A burden is put upon reason to test these out. In all ages, theology has been the first and finest of the sciences; it was never more so than in our own day. In all the schools of Christendom theology takes precedence in discussion. Perhaps it is the mastery of the theological ideal that has begotten the critical confusion of more recent decades. Mechanically, oftentimes, men have responded to the impulsions of their theme, affecting novelty and adventure within those awful pales where angels fear to tread. Indeed, careful inquiry probably would show that the critical debacles of the past hundred years, especially those which have vexed the realm of Bible proof, came about through the experimentations of men who felt compelled to write books to maintain their professorial individuality. Thus the letter and spirit of revelation have been embarrassed by a smear of printer's ink.

Nor can the mantle of charity be made to cover the charge of insincerity brought against a large section of this school. From within comes the accusation that some modernists, in their desire to appear rationalistic, have left off being religious. Between the ethical and spiritual apathies that spring from this source, and opposing diversions of uncorrected enthusiasm, the religious thought of the time is largely without centrality or objective. "Adventurous" is the word which sundry pragmatists have appropriated to themselves and their cause. Conservatism might profitably concentrate against this boldness; but there is a better, because a more effective, way, which is appeal to the Book itself, and to a concurrent testimony whose records multiply with the suns.

The phrase, "Back to Christ," variously has been made a party cry by adventurous theologians. Under pretext of conformity, the entire miraculous and revelatory antecedency of the Old Testament has been discarded; and thus despite has been done to the New. Any effort to return to Christ that ignores or discounts the Old Testament canon is either lacking in sincerity, or will encounter insurmountable obstacles in the way of its going. The Scriptures are a unit; and as those of whom they earliest treat were not made perfect without us, so also we are complete only with them. There is one body in which one Spirit has dwelt since the beginning. If the Old Testament fails, then the New Testament becomes impotent, impossible.

A chief cause of defection from Gospel faith has been a discrediting criticism against the Old Testament. The stories of world origins in Genesis, the creation of woman, the serpent and the fall, the flood, Jonah, and else, have been made stumbling-blocks over which thousands have fallen into the slough of despond. Deliverance can come only through a return to the facts and doctrines of the evangel as a whole. The appeal must be from faith disturbed to faith composed; from science suborned and misapplied to science emancipated and made reverent. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is a continuity which ramifies the revelation of both the Old and the New Testament. Until this continuity has secured recognition through its proof tests, providentially assigned to reason, faith must continue to be exposed to the onsets of an alien criticism.

The whole issue of Bible criticism now becomes a matter of evidence. Speculation and hypotheses have lost their place in positive theology. Up to less than one hundred years ago, the evidences of Bible truth centred in literature and history. This testimony was collateral and comparative. The new evidence is scientific, being derived chiefly from the fields of geology and archæology, preponderantly from the latter; though during the past century and a half, a period particularly influenced by rational criticism, geology, strictly defined, has been brought to agreement with the cosmology of Genesis.

As an inspired history, and a body of revealed doctrines, the Bible has not remained unprofited from the criticism of the past. It is debtor to the learning of scholars, and to those critics of both the lower and the higher schools to whom criticism has been as another dispensation. But in withstanding the onsets of pragmatism, the Bible has had to wait through cycles of definition and controversy; while the evidential results coming to it through contemporaneous science have been instant and cumulative.

At the outset of this treatise, we are proceeding to translate the record of geology in support of the cosmology of Genesis; as also, within the lines of a continuous plan of Bible interpretation, we shall develop the voices of history and fact, with other relationships, old and new, especially those of the monuments and archæological remains in general. Neither scholars nor laymen have assessed the true value of geology as a proof of Scripture statement. Scholarship too often has shunned not only the implications of geology, but also the plain facts of its record; while the laity has feared and distrusted what geology might finally bring forth. The true "source" of the early sections of Genesis is to be looked for in the book of the rocks. This we have tried to show.

The sequences of history as being, in their turn, corroborative of Scriptural truth and statement are self-evident, and need no disquisition to set them in their office. This genius of history is illustrated in the reply made to Frederic the Great by his chaplain. "Herr Chaplain," asked the king, "will you give me a concrete proof of the truth of the Holy Scriptures?" "The Jews, your Majesty, the Jews," was the laconic and sufficient reply. But even history must be carefully assessed if it is to yield its best results in the way of testimony.

The significance of archæology as an instrument of criticism is enhanced in the all but inexhaustible possibilities of its output. Professor R. A. S. Macalister, former Director of the Palestine Exploration Fund, in his *A Century of Excavations in Palestine,* while revealing the glories of the task already accomplished, shows that the richest treasures of charismatic antiquity hid in the soil of the Holy Land remain to be uncovered. It is safe to predict that there is not a passage in the Old Testament carrying a relationship to history that, finally, will not be accounted for in a more or less effective approach of archæology. The certitude of archæology already has overturned the bases of pragmatism, and has shown many of its boldest and most confident conclusions to rest upon falsely assumed premises.

The village ruins and sepulchres of the highlands of Judea and Ephraim, the habitats of the writing prophets, remain yet to be examined. Even the heaps about the holy places at Jerusalem still, for the most part, hold their ancient secrets. The Valley of Esdraelon, in whose heart lay the tragedy-scarred field of Armageddon, is flecked over with *tells,* ready to reward the well-directed pick and spade of the archæologist. The lower plain of Jordan, including the western borders of Moab and the region about the historic oasis of Engeddi invite investigation. Indeed, under Dr. Kyle, the plain of the Jordan and the shallow waters of the Dead Sea about the peninsula of Lizan, have been examined with satisfactory, even priceless, results.

Outside of Palestine, but carrying rich promise of ancient Bible evidence, is the whole region of middle and upper Syria, lying eastward, westward, northward and southward from the Amorite city of Aleppo. It is my belief that in the ruins of this region are to be retrieved certain proofs of a most ancient monotheism, in keeping with the claims made in the antediluvian and early postdiluvian records of Genesis. Also here are hid the secrets of the earliest separate Semitic migrations. Here will be settled the relationship of the Babylonians to the general Semitic stock, a matter later to be reviewed in this volume. The results of unfinished work at Ur, in Mesopotamia, the birthland of Abraham, and at Shechem, the earliest Palestine residence of that patriarch, suggest that, eventually, we shall be in possession of astonishing information scarcely more than hinted at in the canonical Scriptures. In this way, archæology has travelled so fast that it has left higher criticism behind, to fall into a slow but enduring ruin after the generation of its present day *anhangers* have died of inanition.

Not alone the direct, but the indirect, testimony of archæology has been of surpassing value in building up Christian evidences. Indeed, even the indirect proof of archæology has been of more general value than most of the major evidences distrained from criticism. For instance, to continue with the patriarch Abraham, tablets retrieved from the general region between Babylon and Ur, and, circumstantially, of the twentieth century B. C., tell of an Abraham, who leased land, hired an ox, paid rent, and travelled in a wagon from Babylon to Palestine. This was not the patriarch Abraham, the son of Terah; but the tablet stories are convincingly suggestive of the value of the patriarchal history. In the same general neighbourhood, in the age allotted to the patriarch, there did live an Abraham, who was shepherd or farmer, and who travelled from the Euphrates to Palestine in the same manner, but not for the same reason, as did his more illustrious namesake.

At Shechem, in 1926, were uncovered two cuneiform clay tablets of the sixteenth century B. C., narrowly missing the period of Jacob's residence there, which account for transfers of grain and possibly of sheep (one of the tablets is a fragment), both in line with the contract made by Jacob with Hamor, the father of Shechem, for an extensive land purchase, for one hundred pieces of silver, the valuation of one hundred lambs.

Direct archæological proofs of Scripture fact are numerous, and grow more numerous each year. In this line stands the black obelisk of Shalmaneser, which makes contact with Israelitish history in the reign of Jehu; the Moabite Stone, which connects with that history in the reign of Omri and Ahab; Sargon's half-erased inscription touching the fall of Samaria; the Siloam inscription; the Tel el Amarna tablets; and probably now, the uncovered altar of Jacob (El-elohe-Israel) at Shechem.

Egypt is rich and promising in Bible contacts. There is little, if any, doubt in the minds of Egyptologists that the mummy of the Pharaoh of the Oppression, Rameses II., meets the gaze of every tourist who goes into the Bulac Museum at Cairo. The ruins of Tahpanes, the Egyptian castle referred to in Jeremiah 43:8 ff., was uncovered by Petrie in 1883-4. It was to this castle that Jeremiah became an unwilling refugee, when a remnant of his countrymen fled thither after the final fall of Jerusalem. The excavator was able to identify the very pavement on which Jeremiah placed stones, or tiles, in symbolizing the judgment of Jehovah which he was directed to denounce against the men of Judah.

Exodus 1:11 tells of the building by Pharaoh of the store cities of Raamses and Pithom. In 1883, the veteran Egyptologist, Edouard Naville, uncovered the sites of these ancient grain repositories, demonstrating that they were constructed of bricks of Nile clay or mud; and also that in some series they had been mixed with straw, while in others they were without such reinforcement; thus strongly corroborating the elemental facts of the Mosaic story. Naville also developed evidence that these cities were not for indwellers, but solely for the laying up of foodstuffs and the bringing together of the trophies of Asiatic wars. The sites were on the extreme northern border of the land. Numerous statues and other Pharonic tokens were found there. There is not a more conclusive testimony to antiquity than this. The Old Testament abides in verity.

But by no means do the proofs of archæology slight the letter of the New Testament. The identification of the synagogue at Nazareth; the uncovered fundaments of the one at Capernaum; the identified pool of Bethesda at Jerusalem; certainty as to the grot of the Nativity at Bethlehem, and as to the now generally accepted sites of Golgotha and Gethsemane, indicate the course that science is taking to make real the memory and knowledge of the Son of Man. The New Testament archæology of Palestine will be, when its record is fully recovered, the Fifth Gospel.

This reflection suggests that, before turning to the main body of this discussion, I should advert to an influence which has become noteworthy in theological circles in this country, its chief centre being in the metropolis. So considerable has this influence become that it has assumed something of the importance of a school. As a system, its effect is to generally discredit the Scriptures. It particularly distresses faith in the New Testament, though it began by deleting the facts and doctrines of the Old. It is a left over, a transition from the older form of higher criticism. By it the Christology of the New Testament, evidenced and realized in the Virgin Birth, the Godhead testimony of the Galilean miracles, the Blood Atonement, the Bodily Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Eternal Session of Christ the Son at the Father's right hand, has been reduced to a subjectivism, varying in nebulosity with the consciousness of the individual tester. Beaten on the field of both textual and historical criticism, this remnant, impressive, it must be allowed, has taken refuge in the dogma of human self-sufficiency, the apotheosis of scientific, social and behaviouristic law, which makes the world its own judge and saviour. The Gospels lie wrecked in its wake.

The interpretation of the call, "Back to Christ," sometimes sounded by this school, becomes a travesty of serious reasoning. Returned to the letter of the New Testament record, it crassly and instantly denies what is by far the most important articles of Christian belief, the Godhead of our Lord and the miraculous history and power of the evangel.

The call, "Back to Christ," if sincere, is to end in the letter of the Scriptures. It is susceptible of but one interpretation, namely, the acceptance of the doctrinal fulness and the Pentecostal experience of the evangel, "the actual oneness of Christ with God, and, as a consequence of that oneness, His taking upon Himself the sins of humanity, and by His divine mediation washing them away." This Christward return must embrace all that is written in the Gospels and the Epistles concerning the divine Birth, Personality and Godhood of Jesus the Christ, "in whom were hid the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge." But this metropolitan collusion has made the Gospels a hodge-podge of fondness and subjectivism, and turned the Galilean into a Know-nothing, a divine Nobody, an alien in the universe which He Himself created.

A manifesto of this influence which has gained recent notoriety puts into the mouth of the Son of God these words: "This is indeed a great universe. We never imagined anything like it when I was here (in Galilee)." Then it adds: "If we could keep the Master talking with us about metaphysical adjustment between religion and the new world view, we might make quite a modernist of Him." How shall this be characterized? The civility of debate forbids the use of the merited word; but it is written in the Book. What becomes of "the record which God gave of His Son?" What becomes of "Jesus that is called Christ?" It is Anti-Christ.

This manifesto demands "an intellectual endeavour to harmonize our religious thinking with the new world view that science has brought." The answer to this is, that science has brought no new view of the world that already does not harmonize with religious thinking as sanely related to the Bible. Instead of accepting the great facts and teachings of Scripture, which history and science have validated, and which fall within their realm, the cry is raised against miracles, which belong to a realm of fact and potency of which science, in the nature of the case, has no knowledge and can never bring to issue. All that science knows, all that science can prove, finds an answer in the canonical Scriptures; but the higher course of revelation lies along levels forever out of the reach and sight of science, when even at the height of its most exact conclusions. If there be nothing transcendent in the realm of religious thought; if there be nothing that is miraculous; nothing that outrides the laws of physical force, then the tables of the Commandments are no more than the multiplication table, and our dreams of future felicity and immortality are but striations on brains that are not different in substance and output from lumps of radium; for, assuredly, these, immortality and a future felicity, are miracles of the highest and most enduring order. So also is the soul; and so the mind, in its last definition. Of these the Scriptures are the explication and the pledge.

But, again, this manifesto says: "A generation's religion must make peace with its knowledge." What knowledge? Whose knowledge? That of Einstein, H. G. Wells, or Voliva? The choice is open. But are not the Scriptures knowledge, and still the best and highest which has ever reached us? Whither shall we go? to whom shall we turn? Suppose the reformers of the sixteenth century, Reuchlin, Melanchthon, Myconius and the rest had made peace with the scientific knowledge of their day, as against their religion, where now would religion be? Indeed, where would science be? Science then was an admixture of alchemy, nominalism, relativities and neo-Platonism. St. Paul is justly esteemed the interpreter of Christianity to the ages. Suppose he had made peace with contemporaneous scientific knowledge; with Gnosticism; with the syncretisms of Ephesus, where would Christianity be? Again, where would science be? Where, indeed, would civilization be? In St. Paul's day, there were as proud and confident pragmatists as today; but their conclusions were not knowledge in any true or dependable sense. Fifty years from now much of our science will seem as impossible to our posterity as the science of Abelard and Paracelsus now seems impossible to us. Long before the century shall have passed, the glamorous knowledge that now so obsesses this metropolitan group, and upon which it stakes its disregard of the written Scriptures, will dissolve and reintegrate into another form, and to another end.

But equally destructive with the Christological heresies of the school referred to above is the very modern conclusion concerning sin. A representative statement of this conclusion is to the effect that the phrase, "forgiveness of sins," a thought which meant much to the people of a former generation, has lost its significance and relevancy in our times. Had this been a voice deploring what all, too sadly, must recognize as true, it had carried a force of conviction and correction. But it came as a silent, if not positive, endorsement of that which accounts for the canker of modernism at the heart of a wide section of the Church today. The "adventurous" subjectivism which has stripped from the Creed: "I believe in Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," finds it easy, nay, necessary, to eliminate: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Self-controlled lips, indeed, may go on repeating the formula from Sabbath to Sabbath; but a lying will has counted the whole canon of Scripture to be but a "scrap of paper," and has given the universe of spiritual things over to bewildered minds and stumbling guides.

II

THE AGE OF CREATION

THE Bible is a purposeful identification of the origin and continuance of the material universe; as also of the spiritual power and prescience attending and expounding the same. In the earliest statements of Genesis, a dash of phraseology covers all cosmic time anterior to the beginning of terrestrial things. These phrasings illuminate chaos and discover the relationships of eternity. "In the beginning . . . the Spirit of God moved . . . and there was light." It is enough. Even the unaided eye of the intellect may drink the polarized rays of that light, back to a time when there was "not anything made that was made." The terse majesty of this introduction contrasts destructively with the diffused details and grotesque climaxes of the creation literature of Babylon and other polytheistic nations. Otherwise, also, for sanity and certitude, the Bible stands unique and unapproached amongst the masterpieces of antiquity.

That the Bible is not a scientific book has been too readily assumed by the secular mind, and too quickly allowed by religious teachers. Technically speaking, it is not scientific; neither is any other form of pure history. The Old Testament is the literature of a people whose main concern was the religious ideal; while the New Testament is wholly given to the realization of that ideal. Neither science nor history is the main concern of the canon; and yet there is no statement of Scripture, touching either history or science, that is not undergirded with fact and truth. The cosmogony of Genesis, upon a review of which we are about to enter, does not involve, for instance, questions of the manner of man's creation, nor of the transmutation of species; but it does involve the question of the scientific integrity of the record, when that record enters into fact and detail. In this respect, Genesis is a scientifically correct book, originating in a time when its data could have come only through inspiration, or from a most extraordinarily authoritative human source. Redundancy well may be risked in saying that both knowledge and inspiration are evident throughout the canon; and nowhere more certainly than in Genesis.

Thirty-five years ago, William E. Gladstone and Professor Thomas H. Huxley, in England, and with the whole scientific world for an audience, controversially discussed the issue as to whether or not the then stated categories of geology agreed with the cosmological categories of Genesis. A world concensus seemed to testify to a drawn verdict; but, were the issue to be decided today, the verdict would be positive for Genesis. Geology has so corrected the results derived from its data of a century and a half that these results now approximate the record of Genesis. The old arrogance of monism having leached out of its earlier concepts, geology has become continually more tractable and accordant. Also, it faces the record of having changed, more than once, the bases of its interpretation, while Genesis has changed not so much as once. In essential facts, Genesis and geology agree.

The cosmological section of Genesis, that is, the so-described *Elohistic* paragraphs of the first and second chapters, is, from a scientific viewpoint, the most challenging, the most surprising and the most compelling writing to be found in the libraries of the ages. As a psychological marvel, it has no parallel. Radical criticism has delighted to point out the likenesses between the Hebrew cosmology and that read from the Sumerian-Babylonian tablets; but the critics have seldom tarried long enough to study the differences between these writings; and it is in their differences that the truth is established. The likenesses generally describe the unity of the Hebrew and other Semitic creation literatures in an original of most ancient standing; while the differences describe the fidelity of the Hebrew record to that ancient source, and the departure of the non-Hebrew from the same; and, therefore, stamp the latter as mythical.

Familiarity with the cosmologies of the early Semitic peoples as, for instance, that in the summary of the Creation Tablets of Assurbanipal is the end of cavil against the account found in Genesis. In not a single case do the non-Hebrew creation stories rise to even a rudimentary resemblance to the categories of geology; and, without exception, they caricature creative power and shame the most childish ideal of human intelligence; while Genesis anticipates by more than three thousand years every essential point and relationship in the science of terrestrial creation. It is superfluous to ask what should be thought of this. To say that the cosmological knowledge exhibited in Genesis came in the ordinary way of investigation, test and deductive reasoning is to allow that, in very ancient times, there flourished a scientific school, or fellowship, whose records, and the results of whose inquiry, have perished, except for this *Elohistic* source (if so it must be named) in Genesis.

In supposing the existence of such a fellowship of scientific knowledge in early antiquity, no violence is done to intelligent thinking; for a community of primeval understanding of exact method and wide range becomes continually more probable. Eventually, it will be discovered that this hypothesis is the only one by which may be explained certain staring and startling facts left in the path of archæological uncovering. The architecture, engineering and sanitation schemes accounted for in the remains of excavated Semitic cities, as Babylon, Ur and Shechem, not to speak of tablet writings and the records of astral knowledge, all point back to unannalled previous centuries in which study and advance were the order, describing a state of knowledge superior to that testified to by any monuments or remains yet uncovered.

But if this scientific knowledge be ruled out, then revelation through individual illumination becomes the one possible explanation of the cosmological phenomenon of Genesis. I have long held it to be self-proved that a very ancient traditional science, as also an equally ancient record-keeping art, coupled with individual illumination, were the source of the cosmology and the *toledoths*, or the patriarchal genealogies, of the book of Genesis. The grounds for this argument are neither fanciful nor fond; but it would require extended space fully to set them forth. When perfect sanity shall rule in the realm of scientific Bible criticism, this fact of an ancient scientific age not only will be apprehended; but will become the starting-point of a new and illuminating investigation into the intellectual status of primeval civilization. But science, in the main, is now too much obsessed with the idea of a brute beginning of the race to give heed to a theory so contradictory of its ruling hypothesis. As contradicting modern intellectual pride, and as giving challenge to a juster evaluation of antiquity, the cosmological record of Genesis becomes juridical and monumental.

The volume of Professor Huxley, *Science and Hebrew Tradition*, which I read in my study-years, and which has been re-read in recent months, impresses me as the utterance of a man impatient, prejudged and incapable of giving respectful study to the venerable literature which he so much decried; and this has been characteristic of his successors in criticism. But fifty years have passed since Professor Huxley wrote his petulant book; and Genesis continues to speak for itself. A hypothetical situation will help us better to understand this.

If there should be discovered today, in some demotic *tell* in Egypt, a papyrus manuscript which should be unquestionably identified as a lost section of the histories of Herodotus (which, by no means is impossible, as there are significant lacunæ in his writings); and should this manuscript carry a description, under aboriginal names, of the Amazon and its tributaries, with their littorals, as his extant writings do with the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates system, the cosmological situation in Genesis would be paralleled. Only two explanations of such Herodotian account would be possible; either that the Father of History, two thousand years before the voyage of Columbus, had secured his information from some intelligent native of, or visitor to, the Western continent; or else that it had been imparted to him through an oracle. The book of Genesis has remained unquestioned in its present form, at least, since the time of Ezra, two thousand years, and more, before the first speculations of Lamarck, the father of geology; and yet Genesis is a replica of "the record of the rocks," a complete prepositive statement of the main terms of modern cosmogony. To show this is our present business.

At the outset, it will be profitable to assess the categorical results of geology, so as the more effectively to contrast them with the originals of Genesis. The history of terrestrial creation, as suggested in astronomy, and fully brought to form in geology, may be divided into six ages, namely, the Cosmic, the Archæan, the Paleozoic, the Mesozoic, the Cenozoic, and the Recent. The Cosmic age is unknown to geology, lying beyond the limits of its inquiry, and describes the æons during which the mass of the earth's matter was part of the solar nebula, which probably originally extended throughout the entire space of the present solar system. All attempts of science to reduce the nebular hypothesis to an order of working details have failed. By some, indeed, the hypothesis has been rejected; at best, it remains no more than a safe speculation. Elementally, it is scientific; and none other has been stated or conceived of that might take its place.

When the matter of the earth broke away from the shrinking and rapidly revolving solar mass, it was swung into an orbit of its own; and began, at once, to obey the laws of force and motion. This was the beginning of the planetary age of the earth. Here, as we shall presently show, Genesis and geology meet in perfect testimony.

At this time, the earth was a blazing, burning star, or a subsun, revolving about the original or mother sun, which already had given off the greater planets as huge nebulous masses. The diameter of the sun, burning then, as now, was many times greater than at present, as also was the diameter of the earth and its sister planets. But the process of cooling and shrinking had begun; a process which still goes on in Jupiter, for instance, and in the sun, though so imperceptibly that the millenniums of civilization have not recorded a perceptible difference in planetary relations.

During the Archæan age, no life appeared upon the earth. That was the time of the formation of the igneous rocks; the matter that cooled down from the heat of the original cosmic fires, granite, gneiss and porphyry being of this classification. Some geologists, through a too evidently critical incentive, have suggested a period toward the end of the Archæan age, which they call the Archæozoic, in which they claim to detect signs of rudimentary organic life. These signs are not fossiliferous in character; but appear as traces of carbon. The argument is this: of the elements, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen and carbon, chiefly composing the matter of animal organisms, carbon only is a solid, and when resolved appears in the form of graphite. These carbon traces in the so-called Archæozoic are in the form of graphite. But graphite is found in not a few places unconnected with former organisms. However, the Archæan traces of graphite, if identified with organisms, would put animal life before plant life, which would upset the order of geology, which here strictly agrees with that of Genesis. The theory is untenable; as it is unbelievable.

Following the Archæan, comes the Paleozoic age, beginning with the Cambrian, or period of ancient life. Grass, herbs and trees; zoophytes (half plant, half animal), and mollusks, the invertebrata, appear in an order common to Genesis and geology. Within this age is also the dawn of the Devonian period, in which fish life begins. It is also the beginning of the periods of the vertebrata; it is strictly the order of Genesis and geology. Fourth in order of the primal ages is that of the Mesozoic, or middle life. It includes the period of reptiles, birds and marsupials, the beginning of the higher vertebrata. The fifth age is the Cenozoic, or new life; mammals, cattle, lemurs; and then apes and anthropoids, the inferior primates, making up the genera to the end. For convenience, a sixth age, the Recent, may be imagined, including the later Tertiary and the Pleistocene, which is the age of man. There are intercalary passages of the creation section of Genesis which transcend, but do not contradict, the record of geology. These are cosmic in an important sense; and introduce both astronomical and geological data into the Genesis recital. These we shall notice as we advance, with a particular comparison of geology and the Genesis text.

The genetic " days " of the Mosaic cosmogony have been a stumbling-block to literalistic interpreters. It would be childish to discuss in this age the significance of the six " days " of creation. The Hebrew word is *yom*, and it is so palpable that periods and cycles are meant in its use that it is surprising to find that any other construction was ever put upon it. Genesis 2:4 sums the united periods of creation (the whole six " days ") into *one day*, thus giving the real meaning of the word as used by Moses: " These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the *day* that the Lord God made earth and heaven." Modern geology has adopted *hemera* (Greek for *day*) as a synonym for a geological period. Thus geology has gone to Genesis for its chief technical term.

We now sum the geological data of Genesis for comparison with the categories of geology:

Genesis 1:1: *"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."*

This passage covers the cosmic age; it is the yesterday, so to speak, before the first day of the week of creation. It spans the unimaginable duration falling between chaos and the beginning of terrestrial order. As already noticed, it is an age of which geology knows nothing. It is the preface which force and primeval law have written to the book of the universal creation. The story of Genesis properly opens with the close of this age, as I think the language itself makes clear.

Genesis 1:2: *"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."*

As already noticed, this is the beginning of the Archæan age of the earth. The recognition is common to Genesis and geology. Genesis makes no note of life in this age; and geology finds no fossil or other token of organic existence. The correspondence is literal. The vast duration describes the long forenoon of the " first day " of the cosmological week.

At the beginning of the Archæan age, the earth then being a mass of molten matter, or of unorganized atoms in a state of incandescence, the great heat which it gave out produced an envelope of steaming vapours, thick, impenetrable and vastly extended about the globe. " Darkness was upon the face of the deep " (Hebrew, *tehom,* abyss, which aptly described the vacuity which encompassed the terrestrial surface).

Moreover, the planetary mass was then "without form, and void;" though under the laws of force and motion, and through the cooling of its crust, it was approaching a shape of fixed sphericity.

As the vapourous canopy cooled to a degree, its constituent particles precipitated, and settled as a boiling watery sea on the surface of the planet. This lower sea, with the aqueous canopy, made a continuous ocean upward to a prodigious height. "And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." A divine prescience and presence wrought through the watery cloak, not only to give "form" to the vast "void" of matter; but also to bring it to those happy conditions of sedimentation and fructification which at last became favourable to life in its highest form. The Spirit brooding of the waters also prepared the way for the coming of light to the darkened planet. The *motif* of the *Elohist*, who at last is the inspired author of Genesis, in associating the brooding of the waters by the Spirit with the beginning is to show that the light was primordial, and was not created at the dawn of the Archæan "day" of terrestrial beginnings. The fiat, "Let there be light," was an order of accommodation, and not of begetting, as the proof will show.

Genesis 1:3: "*And God said, Let there be light; and there was light.*"

The cooling down of the earth mass continually lessened the thickness and density of the vapourous canopy, through reduced radiation and vapourization. This resulted in the rifting of the canopy; and so, for the first time, the light, breaking through, shone on the face of evolving earth. This was not a light reflected from incandescent matter; but was the polarized light of the open universe, from the sun and from the remotest stars whose glow could master the intervening voids.

" Bright effluence of bright essence, increate."

Genesis 1:4, 5: "*And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness called he night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.*"

When stripped of its mantle of vapour; or when this was rolled into cloud masses, with generous intervals of space between, the diurnal motion of the planet exhibited the phenomenon of day and night; where before had been continually the smothered glare of molten scarps and smouldering moonpits. If the Genesis statement of the time and manner of the diurnal recurrence of day and night on the face of the earth was of inspirational instigation, it fits in with an inevitable scientific conclusion; if it be the result of some ancient scientific inquiry, or method of cosmological calculation, then it transcends; and, in either case, it settles the Book upon a basis of indisputable authority.

With the appearance of the perfectly polarized white light, whiter and more intense than in any succeeding age, then pouring upon the planet; and with the settled succession of light and darkness, the fitting close of the first day of creation had come. "And the evening and the morning were the first day." It was then that the earth was set apart from cosmos.

Genesis 1:6-8: *"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of (between) the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so. And God called the firmament heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."*

Now the formless clouds, under the action of light and the open sun, settled into their classifications of cumulus, stratus, cirrus and secondary complexities. The seasons of the early and the latter rains also thus were provided. The waters of the cloudy seas above descended; and the surplus waters on the earth floated upward in the marvellous balancing of aerial convections and wind currents. In the meantime, and antecedently, a broad pellucid expanse obtained between the floating waters of the clouds and the submerging waters that clung about the mass of the planet. That expanse was the *firmament* of our reading (Hebrew, *raqia*, the open atmosphere). And thus closed the second day of earth building.

The Genesis record carries into the activities of the second day of creation a much briefer detail than into the first and the succeeding four days. The activities of the age refer only to the dividing of the waters and the fixing of the firmament. This would seem to argue a much shorter " day;" but, in fact, it must have been longer, far longer. Changes in the ether expanse; the evolving of atmospheric conditions and stability, which regulated the distribution of light, were much slower than the atomic changes in the mass of the planet. The accommodation of the terrestrial atmosphere to the interpenetration of cosmic light, and to the conservation of perpetuating forces (or relativity, if so it must be), marked one of the longest chapters in the history of the preparation of the earth for the life of man. It was a long day, and the evening came auspiciously.

Genesis 1:9, 10: *"And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he seas: and God saw that it was good."*

The constantly ascending and falling waters enswathing the planet had slowly cooled its crust, and thus made of it a huge bomb, the heat pressure of its pent-up internal fires finding vent only through primeval under-water volcanoes. At length, the imprisoned gases exploded, as with infernal force, and ripped the planet along its latitudes and longitudes. Formless mountain ledges were lifted up, and deep fissures and basins were opened beneath the waters. The hitherto shoreless ocean sank to its level in the depressions and cups thus formed in the earth's crust; while the reverse "lips" of world fissures, with their wide extended scarps were lifted to altitudes vastly greater than that of the highest mountains of today. And thus were the waters "gathered together unto one place" (left in one place); and so also was "the dry land" made to appear.

Torrential hot rains now descended on the mountains and their scarps, dragging down their dizzy altitudes and washing their matter into silt which was deposited in the seas and along low levels and valleys, thus beginning the formation of sedimentary and stratified rocks, such as are the chief exhibit of the earth's surface today. Plasticity and the prophecy of genial conditions were now coming to matter; and the planet was being made ready for life. Through this doorway, Genesis and geology enter side by side.

Genesis 1:11-13: "*And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth. And it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind: and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day.*"

This opens the Paleozoic age of creation; the age of ancient life; and here again the categories of Genesis and geology agree. Logically and scientifically, grass and herbs came first upon the earth. This is the record of Genesis; it is also the record of the rocks. However, there is need for some definition of terms, lest the student get a mistaken notion of early Paleozoic plant life. The herb genera were at first sparse and flaccid, due to the lack of perfect sunshine, as one would feel justified in saying. Geology accounts for but little true plant life in the Cambrian period, the delimited zone of life beginning. For this reason, we might say that the testimony of Genesis is interesting, if not conservative. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass" (Hebrew, *deshe,* tender grass). As naturally would be expected, the earliest duration of the Cambrian period shows traces of a vegetable life of the simplest types and forms. The fossils of some of these are like the paths of worms in the ancient littorals in which they grew; but they are herbs, and were succeeded by definite vegetable species of leaf and fruit. The statement of Genesis is not haphazard; but exact and dependably true. And thus closed the third " day " of creation.

Genesis 1:14-19: *"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth. And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the fourth day."*

As compared with the record of geology, this is as before suggested, an intercalary period. Although strictly scientific, it lies beyond the boundaries of geology. It is astronomical and cosmological, and therefore transcends the categories of modern cosmogony. It divinely enhances the Genesis story.

The critics have made light of this passage, and of its place in the story of creation. But it is correctly placed, and is tremendously significant. As already affirmed, it is scientific both as a postulate and a date. It comes after the third day of creation; the day on which the cloud canopy was rifted and lifted from the earth. On that day, the sun, the moon (for it also was orbited), and the stars broke through the mist and clouds. It was then also that the moon, with the sun, took up its office of governance in the changing diurnal order. Granted that the language is poetic and allegorical to a degree, its scientific correctness and appositeness are amazingly significant.

Attention is called to the related phrases: " and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also." Our English translators added the words, " *he made,*" which gives the impression that the Genesis cosmologist meant to affirm that the stars were made only on the fourth day of the earth's creation. We are not to understand him to mean that the sun and the moon even were made on that day. They had long been made; but on that day they were set to mark the succession of day and night on the earth's surface. In the passage referring to the stars, the Hebrew is properly construed to read: " The lesser light was set to rule the night; and the stars also (were set to rule the night "). This construction disposes of one of the idlest, and yet one of the most arrogant, of pragmatic criticisms.

Genesis 1:20(a): "*And God said, Let the waters* *bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life.*"

This is the noonday of the Cambrian period; life begins in the waters, as here asserted in Genesis and testified to by geology. First, the "tender grass," the "green herbs," and then organic animal life. There indeed appears to be a half-way house of animal life in the zoophytes, the rhizopods and radiolaria, which are animal; but curiously suggest an amorphous plant life struggling toward animal organism. But the earliest form of life on the planet, by both testimonies, is shown to be of simplest vegetable forms.

But along with the maturing of plant life, the Cambrian womb begins to spawn its multitudinous forms of undersea and littoral animal life, the invertebrata: mollusks, gastropods, crustaceans, worms, "the moving creature that hath life." But, like the early plant life, these animal organisms must abide near, or in, the water. Their existence was dependent on moisture. The fierce sunshine withered them quickly, when once removed from their watery habitat. Geology has made this diagnosis of the essentially aquatic character of the most ancient animal life. But Genesis was there beforehand. "Let the waters bring forth." Is it thinkable that a traditional mythical story-monger could have devised so remarkable a scientific fact? Or if one such, is it thinkable that a whole catena of such facts could be imagined in such order as to constitute the most remarkable cosmological disquisition in the records of the ages?

During this fourth day of Genesis, the Devonian period of geology begins; and now fish life appears in the seas. This also is a mutual order of Genesis and geology; and, likewise, is the noontide of the according testimony of these two records.

Genesis 1:20(b)-21: *"And fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind; and God saw that it was good."*

This covers the noonday and the ending of the Devonian period, "the age of fishes;" * as also the beginning of the Permian period, the end of the Paleozoic. The Mesozoic, or middle life age begins to dawn. Gigantic organisms, monsters of the deep, as also of the land, supported by the swarming sea life and the luxuriant flora, come into existence. "Great whales," and the earliest of the vertebrata; reptiles of the land and sea. Then followed bird life, "every winged fowl after his kind." At the end of the Mesozoic age the earliest quadrupeds, rodents and marsupials appear; and thus closes the fifth "day" of creation.

Genesis 1:24, 25: *"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle*

---

* The specific word, "fish," or "fishes," is not used in this passage, which describes the fulness of Devonian life. "The moving creature that hath life" (Hebrew, *nephesh hayya*) includes the entirety of marine vertebrates, fishes, amphibians and reptiles. But in Genesis 1:25 the word fish (Hebrew, *dagha*) is used; and in the comprehensive sense, referring to the same created group, as in this passage. The term and its locative relationship are thus fully identified.

and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good."

This is the Cenozoic age, or the age of new life. It embraces the Tertiary. It is the age of mammals, cattle, lemurs, apes and anthropoids. "Cattle . . . and beasts of the earth" is the Genesis designation of the characteristic types. It accords with the record of the rocks. But a significant pause comes in the course of geological goings. Fossils, in the proper sense of that term, cease. The period of the consummation approaches, and with that approach, the mystery of life deepens. The age of man is at hand; but of the how, the when, the where of his beginning geology can reach no satisfactory conclusion. But Genesis is present with an answer; not one that contradicts science; but rather one that completes its record. It places the creation of man at that stage, and in that order, of life that perfectly comports with the conclusion of geology.

Genesis 1:26: *"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."*

Man thus stands apart from all precedent creation. There is no fossil man; there is no missing link. It would require much greater space than we have at command to take up and deal with the issues of human origin raised by modern evolutional science. It is enough here to say that the best of that hypothesis is speculative and dogmatic; and that Genesis furnishes the only answer that ever can be proposed to the question of man's descent. Elsewhere, I have suggested that science must turn to a study of the human cell as the path to an understanding of the spiritualized organism of man and the other phenomena of his being. The difference between the body of man and the bodies of the lower orders of animals, even of the highest of the inferior primates, is in this cell. Comparative fœtology shows a dynamic in the human cell which is convincing of separateness and isolation.

After this comparison of the categories of Genesis with the results of geology, it will be conclusive of our contention if we show that Genesis as completely disagrees with all ancient cosmologies as it agrees with the order and classification of geology. That body of non-Hebrew creation literature to which Genesis bears an occasional incidental resemblance, and to which pragmatic criticism has referred it as a source, already has been noticed, the Sumerian-Babylonian creation story, read from a tablet taken from the library of Assurbanipal at Nineveh. This tablet, as deciphered by George Smith, opens thus:

> "In a time when the heaven above was not named
> And the earth beneath bore no name . . .
> When was the abyss, *Tiamat*, the mother of both . . .
> Then were born the gods Lachma and Lachamu."

Here, at the outset, are two tremendous differences between Genesis and the tablets. In the tablets, the "abyss" existed before the heaven and the earth; indeed, the heaven and the earth are its offspring, as were the gods themselves. In Genesis, the heaven and the earth are concomitants of the abyss, or deep, the potentialities of each emerging in one fiat of the Creator. To be sure, the earth was void and without form; but its constituent matter was part of the cosmic original.

Again the tablets are at this tremendous variance from Genesis—namely, the abyss (*Tiamat*) existed before deity came into being. Deity is, therefore, not the Creator. Indeed, *Tiamat* and *Ocean*, the upper and the nether waters, mingling, produced the gods; after Lachma and Lachamu, a host. Genesis opens with: "In the beginning God"—the uncreated eternal Elohim—of His own mandate, and in amazing order, created the heaven and the earth and all that in them is. How far removed from the grotesqueness and inanition of the tablets!

And what shall be said of the string of gods chronicled in succession, Lachma, Lachamu, Anshar, Kishar, Anu, Ea, Marduk, Nudimmud—lords many and gods many? Against these stands in Genesis the one God, Jehovah Elohim, who said: "Let there be light, and there was light!"

According to the tablet story, war arose between *Tiamat* and the gods which she had produced. The gods

> "Prepare for war with gestures of rage and hate,
> With combined might to begin the battle."

But *Tiamat* moves furiously to the assault; the gods are dismayed and falter. The language used concerning them by the tablets is not complimentary. They are seen to be cowards, these gods of Babylon.

> " Nudimmud was afraid, and turned cowering back . . .
> Lachma and Lachamu heard and were afraid."

At last Marduk, one of the younger gods, assumed the rôle of leader. By a ruse he takes *Tiamat* in a net, and then slays her.

> " Dividing her body, wise plans he laid.
> Into two halves, like a fish, he divided her.
> Out of one half he made the vault of heaven."

The next tablet is missing. It probably told how Marduk, of the other half of *Tiamat*, made the world. Thus the abyss disappears. In Genesis it remains after heaven and earth are created. In the tablet story, *Tiamat* becomes " the mother of both heaven and earth;" and thus there are two creators. Genesis knows but one Creator, the eternal Jehovah. The resemblance is more than fanciful.

The assumption seems to be that the Assyrian word, " *Tiamat*," used as the name of the abyss, is genetically the same word as *tehom*, " the deep " of Genesis, and that the author of Genesis was led to adopt it as such. As we already have suggested, there may be a fanciful resemblance in the forms of the two words; but if *Tiamat* is derived from the Semitic word *am*, which is mother, or generator (Chaldean, *amah*, stock, family), then it has not a remote kinship with *tehom*, derived from the Hebrew radical, *hu*, meaning void, or waste. The author of Genesis could not have had the name *Tiamat* in mind when he adopted his word " deep " or " abyss." The Babylonian tablet thus describes the brood of *Tiamat:*

> " The mother of the abyss, she who created them all,
> Unconquerable warriors, gave them giant snakes . . .
> They rear their bodies; none can resist their breast."

Contrast these lines with that simple strophe in Genesis:

> "And the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of
> the waters."

Genesis and geology agree that vegetable and animal life came upon the earth in a series of phenomenal and orderly successions, and that these successions were crowned with the creation of man. There is room in Genesis for everything that geology may legitimately and reverently deduce from the phenomena of these successions. To complete these deductions is the task of science; to pass upon them will be the task of faith and knowledge. Before science can reach any safely final conclusion concerning the manner of man's creation, it must deal, as it has not yet dealt, with the deepest fact of human ontogeny, the dynamical and exceptional character of the germinal cell of man's body. Professor Joseph Le Conte traced the whole differentia of man's life to this cell. In its dynamical character and in its intellectual and spiritual entailments he found the beginning and continuance of that supreme moment when Jehovah breathed into man's nostrils "the breath of life, and he became a living soul." This philosophy cannot be escaped. The impact of the cosmos has been upon the human cell. Professor Le Conte was certain that the crisis of this impact produced the human body and life of man *per saltum*, that his consciousness awoke "in the twinkling of an eye," and that he was *man* from that moment forward. Man thus passed through no doubtful and temporizing stages which simulated manhood, but his life began in a spiritual climax visited upon matter existing, in what previous consistency, Genesis does not say.

Let the most astute scientist answer this question: If organic life began as a purely physical no-sexed, one-celled nucleus and at once integrated into a functioning protozoan or other primordial animal, why might not highly sensitized, cosmos-impacted, and spiritualized matter have been integrated into the body of man, emerging as the finality and crown of creation? The origin of man and the origin of the other primates are those of *adjacency*, but not of *identity*. The bodies of both are from the dust. The resemblances in the organisms of the primates cannot be denied; but even when the anthropoid is set over against man, the problem of these resemblances, compared with the problem of man's intellect and soul, certified in his life cell, is as an asterisk set over against a fixed star. A hundred million years on the basis of evolution could not account for this difference. How pitiable, then, the brief epoch which science knows to lie between the creation of the inferior primates and that of man.

Thus the creation of man, according to Genesis, stood apart from all the other works of the Most High, and this is and must always be the testimony of geology. It exhibits, fossilized and lithographed within the strata of the successive complexities of the earth's crust, from the pre-Cambrian to the Cretaceous and the Tertiary, types of the long procession of species and kinds, certifying to nearly all the existing orders; but amongst them all is no trace of man; no fossil remains to connect the "paragon of animals," "the image of God," with the matrices of this workshop of the rocks. Science has dreamed and hoped, but in vain, that it should find some evidence in the museum of the rocks which would show the culmination of the lower animal organisms in the body of primeval man. There is no fossil man; there is no missing link, let it be repeated. That is the too unwilling testimony of geology. The afternoon of the sixth *hemera*, by the testimony of geology itself, is Cenozoic. In it appear no distinct types of lower animal life, and it exhibits no fossils, and in this it agrees with the word of Genesis.

III

THE ANTEDILUVIAN AGE

THE word *creation*, as used in Genesis in connection with the beginning of man's life on the earth, is idealized by reason of certain purposeful statements that follow in the narrative. First, man is made in the image and likeness of Jehovah, whereas all other animal organisms, including the inferior primates, are created after their own kind; second, man is given dominion over all beasts and living creatures on the land and in the seas, and is commanded to subdue the earth and master its forces; third, an equal and separate emphasis is put upon the creation of woman, and the general dominion is made a joint one. Sexuality receives no mention throughout the lower orders of creation. It was there of no moment to the record and, therefore, was left only in implication; but, in view of the coming genealogies, and the office of woman in the future destinies of the race, it was meet that the parity of human sexhood should be affirmed. "Male and female created he them." This parity is further emphasized in the particular account of the forming of Eve from a rib of Adam. Identity of nature thus, also, is established. But much more is compassed in the story. The process by which the complement of human sexhood was achieved more distinctly separates humanity from the lower orders.

The record of the creation of woman long has been occasion of sceptical criticism. The usual way of disposing of it is to characterize it as a myth or a drift from ancient folklore. This is both childish and self-depreciative. It betrays lack of will, or ability, to look into the fundamental facts. It also betrays lack of imagination, which is a necessary adjunct to both faith and intellectual understanding. From the viewpoint of long settled scientific knowledge, I dare assert that a fact basic in biology and ontology underlies this Genesis account of the origin of woman. I need only hint at the bisecting of the procreative cell, and at the cleavage of the blastoderm, in forming the spine and ribs of the embryonic body. The appearance of the *primitive streak* is the rudimentary beginning of the vertebral system, the spine and the ribs. About this system a definite integration of cells ensues. The bony frame well may be described as the actual beginning of life in the higher animal organism. In fact, it is the keel of being. Here is a backward glance toward a climacteric mystery in the creation of the human species. If the author of Genesis set out to write a myth story of the origin of woman, how did it happen that he hit upon an exact and absolute detail of human biogenesis? There will be much time in which to answer this question.

Science has not sounded the depths of *parthenogenesis,* or virgin birth. Procreation by unisex organisms is not unknown to science. Science also knows that with some primordial forms separate life originates through the breaking off of fragments of these forms, as against the rhythmic fission of cells, which is the rule. Adam Sedgwick, the discoverer of the Cambrian strata, and a nineteenth century master of the technique of geology and biology, says: "The higher generative cells have power of (self) development, but are unable to do so in their normal surroundings." The Overseer of the universe, who put these limitations upon cell life, has power to lift the embargo at His will, and still not violate the laws of nature. With this background of biological phenomena, the story of the creation of woman cannot be dismissed as a *Lorelei* fable. The mystery of Bethlehem was foreshadowed in that creation. Woman herself was the agent of the Incarnation. Both the creation of woman and the Bethlehem Birth were miracles, wrought on a basis of vital atoms.

Profitable attention may be given to the phrase: "In our image, after our likeness," as signalizing both the featural fashion and the intellectual solitariness of man. It has inspired and challenged thought, certainly through the cycle of the Written Word; as, also, without doubt, it did in whatsoever form it preexisted. This likeness must carry an eternal significance; it not only realizes the Godhood's concept of Itself, but stands as the explanation of the material universe. The Galilean Christ was the ultimate of that Image, the first-born of all creation. It would be unprofitable to go into the moral causes behind cosmic phenomena; but both faith and reason see man as the expositive of all. A divine monism relates man, through the cradle of Bethlehem, to the remotest orbs of space. A God-created humanity rises logically to pre-eminence in a God-created universe. The witness of history and consciousness is constant as to the divine likeness in man. History is also the record of an advancing human mastery; while the birthright of woman has moved, like a star, toward the zenith of fulfilling prophecy.

The emergence of the commandment and the beginning of the revelation were coincident with man's creation. Whatever view, of necessity, is to be taken of the physical life of man, and the manner of his making, it is clear that the author of Genesis expects us to put the emphasis on his moral endowments. The sentence which informs us that the body of man was formed from the dust of the ground is followed by the still obtaining discourse: "And the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The unprofitable curiosity which has led science into speculation regarding the evolutional origin of man had no allurement for the cosmologist of Genesis, whose knowledge of creation was profound to the point of inspiration.

The task of science is to deal with physical man as he is, as he has been, and as he is to be. The basis of this task is fixed. There is no reason for believing that there has been any organic or functional change in man's body since that day which is designated as the day of his creation. The most ancient sculptures and bas reliefs show him in his present featural likeness. The cells and capillaries of his body constitute an open book; while the mystery of the psycho-ethical Adam exists in a flame within the cell, kindled by the breath of Jehovah; but that mystery, inhering unassuaged in the posterity of Adam, is locked beyond the reach of microscope, scalpel or chemical analysis. It is through this, once for all, invading breath of the divine that humanity stands isolated from the lower orders. The divineness in man was not acquired, but was dynamically communicated. This is the affirmative of Scripture; and to it science bears testimony in the record of fœtal life and in the evidences of psychic forces at work on the brain and ganglionic centres from the dawn of instinct and intelligence. The propinquity of human origin to that of the inferior primates, or simian orders, cannot be denied; but it was not the origin of identity, nor of genetic relationship. It was independency, inscrutably decreed preeminence. It was the likeness, and yet the difference, of the feathered arrows of cupid and the livid thunderbolts of Jove. A rote of physical evolution applied to man is more unthinkable than an outright miracle. The oldest traces of historic man are of a creature of intelligence and upright stature. The troglodytes of the Ural and the Alpine highlands were subsequent to the city builders and the tablet writers of the early Semitic races. Strictly speaking, prehistoric man is a myth. What passes for that type is an abortion of the enlightened stock.

The theories of evolutionism which have persisted since the days of Lamarck and the early English monists have become top-heavy with unproved and improbable " conclusions " regarding the relations of species and the origin of man. Perhaps no other science has supported so considerable a brood of vagaries as has speculative geology. I particularly have in mind a type of boldness seen in a recently published work on prehistoric man which appears to be passable romance but rather poor science. This and other works of its kind assume with all seriousness that human fossils have been retrieved from early Quarternary caves and coverings, and that these exhibit definite transmutational marks. There is not here space for details; but it will be enough to say that while it is true that very ancient human remains have been discovered, as those of the Neanderthal, the Cro-Magnon, and other specimens, they are not *fossils* in the true geological sense, and do not align the record of man with those species which have their story written in the sedimentary rocks. They belong to the latest yesterday of geology, if indeed they appertain to geology at all, and should not be referred to a department of archæology. Besides, the abnormalities of these so-called human fossils, which are relied upon to prove the descent of man from an anthropoid ancestry, may well be considered as the results of accidents suffered by the individual skeletons and not as homologies and " links " connecting stages of development. Take, for instance, the Neanderthal skull, a cast of which I have examined. The peculiarities of the frontal and anterior structure of the brain cap, especially of the latter, as I recall, easily may have come from an extraneous cause, a contusion or the infiltrations of lime precipitates in the place where it earliest reposed. Some such opinion as this was expressed long ago by Professor Virchow. All the *dolichocephalic* skulls, relied upon as " missing link " arguments, might be matched in individual crania of existing savage tribes or of the plantation Negroes of the South.

An interesting fact emerges in the study of cave drawings of the Stone Age, which the romanticists place at from ten thousand to indefinite years of past dating. These drawings show a truer sense of art than certain picture writings left by Amerinds on the mountain cliffs of Arizona, which also I have examined and which I cannot hold to represent an antiquity of more than a few centuries. The inverted order of this argument destroys its value. The effect of a relatively great age of man on the earth has not yet been established.

The Genesis accounts of the Garden of Eden and the first sin belong to both the history of fact and the philosophy of human consciousness and conduct. It is a gratuity to discuss these accounts as allegories. Allegorical aspects they possess, as does most Oriental history, but underlying them are great facts and realities which can be come at only through an understanding of primeval life and the thought of the most ancient Orient. Both Genesis and geology reveal the fact that at the coming of man the earth was in an ideal state of fruitfulness. Physiology indicates that primeval man was a vegetarian. The inference is also scientific that his first habitat was in or near the tropics and that his habitation was the shades of friendly trees. All this is literally and exactly comprehended in the Genesis story of Eden. The fatal temptation overtook man in this nature paradise. This carried him into the realm of moral issues. How should the historian describe the temptation and the sin to which it led? Jehovah had spoken a commandment which repressed appetency; evil had suggested the license of appetency. The door to appetency was through the physical sense. Could Moses have said simply that man sinned by breaking a moral commandment? The sin was basic and actual in appetite expressed in a literal indulgence. Could the account of it have been put into philosophical form? Let a dialectician of today try it. There is no stronger critical proof of the truth of the Eden story than the form in which it is presented. That which is written is not an address to the catechetical consciousness of childhood, as some think, but it is a great human-level statement of a fact of world history. The serpent as actor in this drama embodies historically the most ancient notion of the race concerning the identity of evil.

The impression gained from Genesis of the theological consciousness of the earliest human age is that of a struggle between nature religion and the zeal of the individual soul, seeking to worship God. Cain and Abel embody these opposites, and become the expositives of the sub-families, or tribes, of which they appear to be the heads. This dualism in the primordial cult runs through the religious consciousness of the ages. It anticipated Parseeism, and whatever of philosophy may have been at the base of the demiurgic contests of Gnosticism. The story as told by the author of Genesis not only described the earliest religious state of the race, but became a forecast of the form and fashion of time-long human thinking.

The old evangel opened with the discovery by Adam, the generic man, of the commandment; but with the equally distinct discovery of his inability to keep that commandment. It was here that the revelation took its characteristic form: " The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," looking toward a fulfilment in which the second man Adam, being a quickening Spirit, not only Himself kept the commandment, but brought to men the power to do likewise. To both this primitive failure to keep the commandment, and this struggle between nature faith and the illuminated individual soul, such as was Abel, we have the answer of history, as also of consciousness, expressed in science, insofar as our distressed and self-confounded psychology may be called a science. But the Eden drama is true to life's frailty as we know life, alas, as too often we have lived it. The lights and shades that glow and deepen about the altars of Cain, the nature priest, and of Abel, the seer of the earliest theocracy, are one and the same with those that visit the individual consciousness of today. We are members one of another from the beginning. Not the corn-sheaf offering of Cain, nor the firstling blood of Abel's sacrifice, determined the merits of the oblation, but the mind of the sacrificer itself. The effort of criticism to tinge the Abel story with a colouring from the P, or Priestly, source is a gratuity. It reverses the order of literary motif and influence and leaves out the vast purposefulness of the ages that accounts for the processes of both thought and faith. Behind the sometimes quaint and allegorical forms of Genesis stands the related and self-sufficient knowledge of what man is and what he is destined to be. The very idioms and verbal forms of the first three chapters of Genesis suggest an antiquity antedating the earliest Hebrew usage in speech. Some of these are found, for instance, in the conversation of the woman with the serpent, and the interview of Cain with Jehovah. They testify to a hoary original.

With all but a single voice, conservative scholarship now allows the writing of the early chapters of Genesis from very ancient calendarial and traditional documents, the final and triumphant refutation of the long-time limping and always impossible source hypothesis. Indubitable proof seems to exist that in the middle of the second millennium before Christ Semitic records of great antiquity were laid up at Kadesh (the Midian of Genesis), through the agency of the Habiri, who were the descendants of the united Heberite Syrian camps of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, left in the Hinterland of Beersheba when Jacob went with his immediate family into Egypt. To these Heberite records Moses had access during the second forty years of his life, while serving as co-priest with Jethro at the shrine of Midian. It was during these forty years that he wrote the book of Genesis, largely compiling it from the aforesaid Heberite records, and while synchronously illuminated by theophanies granted in Horeb, where he kept sacrificial flocks for the altars of Jethro. In the light of this situation, the problems of Genesis, as also those of other Pentateuchal writings, disappear.

It is of much importance to ascertain if any one of the appellatives of Deity, known to Genesis, may have been a survival from the cultic speech of antediluvian man. A lead certainly is at hand. Foremost amongst the problems of the Pentateuch are the groupings of the appellatives, *Elohim*, *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah Elohim*. It was these groupings that led Astruc to attribute a composite character to the Pentateuchal writings. Thus unconsciously were laid the foundations of the so-called source theory. But it is my belief that modal and temperamental attitudes of the writer led to these diversities, where they are not represented in actual transferences of forms and idioms from traditional records. A linguistic argument reverses the higher critical view of the priority of the title of *Jehovah* over that of *Elohim*, the former being assigned by the critics to the supposedly earlier source document. It now appears that the order in Genesis is the correct one. *Elohim* (translated *God*) is the nature name of Deity, and therefore has its moral and proper placing in the record of the six days of creation. But the Israelitish *Jehovah* (translated *Lord*) was the covenant name of Deity, and therefore its proper place is in the account of the giving of the commandment. This easily may be seen by relating the two sections of the creation story, and noting the use of *Elohim* and *Jehovah* as the scenes of the drama change.

A notable illustration of the modal use of these titles is found in the third chapter of Genesis, where Moses puts the nature name of God (Elohim) into the mouth of the serpent and the woman; but reserves to himself the use of the covenant name, *Jehovah.* The connection is absolutely conclusive.

From the linguistic argument, it appears that *El* was the most ancient Semitic designation of the divine Being. This designation is met in the composites, Elohim, Elberith (God of Mastery), El-Elyon (Most High God) or the covenant God, and that long before the Hebrew derived name of Jehovah was in use. The Babylonians, the earliest historically known of the Semitic peoples, carried the name of El with them in their migrations beyond the Euphrates, as is evidenced in the name of their first city, Bab-El, "the Gate of God." To all other Semites the name of *El* was common. This brings to all but a demonstration the claim that this title was the norm, or symbol, of primeval monotheism.

The outgoing of the beginning brought the race to a parting of the way in religious consciousness. Individually illuminated minds multiplied in the struggle with the creed of sense. Simultaneously this triumph found a voice. "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." It was the beginning of formal and collective worship. The race became divided into the sons of God and the sons of men, the latter to prevail in the end, and to bring on the close of the antediluvian age. The advance to a state of reverence and formal worship under a primitive revelation, of which there are many tokens in the course of the Genesis narrative, is in accordance, not only with the emotions of our infancy, "when heaven lies about us;" but is also in keeping with what we have observed of the life of the more untrammelled of the backward races. The North American Indians preserved in the isolation of their forest life a simple monotheism in the worship of the Great Spirit; but they lost that simplicity under the blight of white supremacy. We equally have noticed how infancy grows out of its enchanted state into a harder and more sceptical environment, as have also the races in their order. This was pictured from the beginning.

It will be well to reflect on what seems to be an established fact of the days of the antediluvian giants, who were not only mighty in figure and heft, but of colossal mentality and apprehension. If Genesis be accepted at its face value, and that is the inevitable end of criticism, it follows that there existed among the antediluvians, at the height of the era of the sons of God, a rating of knowledge which even now must be thought of as scientifically exact, so far as it reached phenomena and matter. This should have consisted of an understanding of cosmology, a primitive geology; familiarity with the *toledoths,* or the genealogies of the archons; skill in the working of metals; a rudimentary philosophy, and a theology based on operative inspiration and revelation. Tubalcain, on the material and intellectual side of these phenomena, and Enoch, on the spiritual side, attest a record which perished, except for the materials carried to the chapters of Genesis.

The picture is a familiar one from any viewpoint of modern life. In it are represented sectors of industry, with attendant intellectual activities and the protests of personal righteousness.

Bible students can but be impressed with the absence of all tokens of idolatry or fetichism in the records of antediluvian peoples. The distinction was between monotheism and the fleshliness of life which waxed evil continually. Idolatry belongs to the ages which lie this side the flood, and describes the degradation of monotheism in the moiling together of the races before the dawn of Semitic history. The Semites who went into the Mesopotamian Plain were monotheists; but, through Sumerian entanglements, they became polytheists, and developed the pantheon of Babylonian gods. The temple of El-berith at Shechem, whose foundations were uncovered but four years ago, and which dates back to 2500 B. C., was built as a monotheistic shrine, as, no doubt, was the altar of Melchizedec at Salem; and as probably will be found true of not a few holy seats now wrapped in the ruins of Mitanni and the terrane about Aleppo. All these, sooner or later, yielded their monotheism to the polytheistic backwash from corrupted Babylon. Toward the end of the antediluvian period the sons of God lapsed into the state of nature; and, save for the household of Noah, the worship of heaven ceased from the earth. Appetite and sensuality took its place.

The realistic story of the flood, the ark and Noah neither misstates nor overstates the facts. Noah *was*, and there was an ark, as also there was a flood. The meteorology of the Mesopotamian Plain justifies the assumption of the general inundation described; while the Flood Tablet of Assurbanipal, and its far earlier originals, join with Genesis in affirming it to be of common knowledge in the whole postdiluvian world. The voyage of Jason and his companions in the ship Argo, which all modern critics seem to have accepted as based in fact, is not half so well attested, either from within or from without, as is the Genesis story of the floating of Noah's ark.

The destruction of the race in the deluge, as a retributive visitation, is not without near parallels in authenticated history, as the extermination of the Canaanites, the general slaughter of the Israelites before the exile, and again in the last of the Jewish-Roman wars. The deluge described a tragic transition from an older to a newer time. Less tragic, but not less a transition, were the waste and ruin which came before the fall of the Roman Empire, the disturbances which brought on the Renaissance and the Reformation, the cataclysms which resulted in the French Revolution, and the strifes which produced the World War. In the primitive age, the divine interference took an obvious form; but the phenomena of the latter days of vengeance are corroborative of the record of the former. The punishment of sin has been the same throughout the history of the race.

The close of the diluvian drama was marked by two events, significant in their connection, but also bearing upon the integrity and motif of the Genesis composition. Taking leave of the ark, and entering upon the work of replenishing a newly retrieved earth, Noah offered altar sacrifices of flesh and fire to Jehovah. This situation is simple enough in itself; but the scholastic critic will answer that the story was written from the viewpoint of the Jewish cultic period, and therefore the concept of a sacrifice is allocated to it; that the diluvian oblation was a myth. But how does it happen that all those peoples credited with being descendants of Noah had this concept of sacrifice by fire? It was not innate; no ideas are. Was it, then, the result of universal suggestion? There are no such processes known to the mind. Even instinct does not operate within such narrow limits. The fire sacrifice originated in time and place, and those anciently remote. From that origination, it tended downward through the cycles until arrested within the Christian fulfilment of the concept of sacrifice for sin.

But the account of Noah's sacrifice has given to pragmatism opportunity to counter. Genesis relates: "And Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings upon the altar. *And Jehovah smelled a sweet savour.*" The Gilgamish Epos says that Utnapisthim, the Babylonian Noah, offered a sacrifice to which the gods gathered " like flies, inhaling the sweet smell." Criticism can see here only cause and effect. To the scholastic, the Gilgamish is the original polytheistic version, while the Genesis form is the later reduced monotheistic statement, shutting the Genesis origin up to the period of the Jewish exile in Babylon.

In the first place, the Genesis story of the flood could not have come from the Assurbanipal tablets, for they had been wrapped for two hundred years in the ruins of Nineveh when Ezra left Babylon with the Pentateuchal books to go to Jerusalem. But there were other copies of the Gilgamish? No doubt; but who knows their reading? Copyists were fancifully inexact. New localities created new meanings. There are two known versions of the Babylonian creation story; there are two of the flood epos; how many more, no one can say. It is child's play to contend about it. It is important, too, to note the Hebrew reading of the statement, "And Jehovah smelled a sweet savour." It is: "And Jehovah smelled a savour of rest," which takes away every trace of resemblance.

But, over and above all, the Genesis story of the flood and of Noah's sacrifice bears the stamp of originality and super-antiquity. The Babylonian story, a perverted survival of that original, describes the extreme degradation of primeval monotheism. The progenitors of the Babylonians, when they departed from the family home in the hinterland of Anti-Taurus, knew what Moses later knew; but, at the time of the Gilgamish writing, their descendants were deeply sunken in polytheism; and had lost the wisdom of the archons.

This brings to point the once strongly maintained theory of pan-Babylonism, which at one time represented all but the entire militancy of the higher critical school. Into it related hypotheses flowed like rivers into an inland sea. But, like the Dead Sea, it offered no outlet, and so stagnated into inanition. It seems now to have but poor rating.

The diluvian drama closed with the covenant made by Jehovah with Noah and his posterity. The token of this covenant was the rainbow, which signified that the earth should no more be swept by a deluge. The bow was not an arbitrary sign; but had such reference to laws of meteorology as would indicate exact knowledge, or else point to a revelation transmitted through tradition. Thick and tempestuous clouds, such as are presupposed in connection with the flood, do not show a rainbow. It is only when the sky is half cloud and half sunshine, or at least partly so, that the bow appears. The thought was figurative and parabolical; but it expounded consciousness, and so delivers the story from being classified as a myth. This consciousness ran its course to the climax of the Apocalypse, when a rainbow appears about the head and throne of the Lamb, exalted to Messianic rulership in the heavenlies.

Up to the close of the late World War it was widely conceded amongst scholars that Babylon was the original seat of human civilization. This confidence led to the conclusion that the early Bible stories were derived directly from Babylonian sources, which conclusion is voiced in such writings as Wellhausen's *Einleitung* and Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel*. However, the conjecture must now contend for existence. A multiplying array of proofs seems to show that Babylon was not the oldest, and, certainly, not the determinative, seat of ancient civilization. A comparison of Bible history with the more recent results of archæology and kindred research, will show that the beginning of civilization belongs to a time antecedent to the rise of Babylon and its empire.

The late Professor Albert T. Clay, in four noteworthy volumes, published between 1909 and 1923, traversed the length and breadth of the Babylonist theory of Genesis origins. Naturally, the dissenting critics of every degree of radical commitment were stirred to opposition. The grouping of this opposition has suggested the method of conservative rebuttal, which is not so much to prove the correctness of the anti-Babylonist contention as it is to point out the fallacies of the challenged hypothesis. This has been so thoroughly done that little of the hypothesis remains.

The zeal of the Babylonist school is easily understood when it is considered that the claim of pan-Babylonism is the cornerstone of the radical hypothesis of Old Testament criticism. To admit a non-Babylonian origin of the Genesis stories would mean the instant scrapping of the elaborate system of modern critical text-books and the retirement of a majority of the works on theology and Bible interpretation. But we are prepared to face with calmness the consequences of such an eventuality. It would not be singular in the history of science. The rise and fall of theories are but incidents in the process of truth seeking.

In Chapter IV, in connection with the Scripture accounts of the origin and movements of the Semitic races, as they come into view, we shall treat more at length of pan-Babylonism, in order to determine its alleged bearing on Hebrew religion and thought.

But before leaving the field of antediluvian fact and discussion, we must advert to a theme which involves the unity of the Old and the New Testaments, on the highest levels of spiritual manifestation. This relates to the Personality and ministry of the Holy Spirit as revealed in those sections of Genesis delimited by the creation epoch and the period of the postdiluvian covenant. Genesis testifies both to the manifestation of God the Creator and to the active office of God the Spirit. Only from the viewpoint of this testimony can be had the highest appraisement of the Scriptures through the ages. The antediluvian witness to the work of the Spirit strongly supports the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The dispensation of Pentecost was rooted in the dispensation of the beginning.

In the opening passages of Genesis, the Spirit is differentiated from *Elohim,* the Creator, in that the ordering and vivifying of creation are shown to have come through this office. This concept anticipated the New Testament work of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation, in the awakening of sinners, the sanctification of believers and the enduement of the saints in spiritual baptism. The Old Testament revelation anticipated, but did not bring in, the manifestation of the Son. That was reserved for "the fulness of time." It was the Spirit who brought that fulness to its day, and so sealed the unity of His office in the Old and the New.

In the Genesis revelation, the Holy Spirit is seen as giving life to the cosmic universe; bringing divine enduement to newly created man; ministering spiritual enlightenment to the antediluvian patriarchs; speaking judgment against old world sins, and creating the ideals of Messiah's coming kingdom.

In our summary of the Spirit's office and work in the primeval age, grammatical aspects and locative relations of the Genesis text must be considered. The conception of the unity of the Godhead by all Old Testament writers was such that, while they perceived the personality of the Spirit, as also that of " the Seed of the Woman," their use of distinguishing appellatives was not uniform. However, discrimination is sufficiently constant to establish the certainty of their apprehension. The passage which at the very door of creation introduces the dispensation of the Spirit is not only without question as to import; but furnishes a key by which other embracements are to be unlocked.

The supersensuous side of science reflects the fact of an over Spirit in nature, influencing its laws and interfusing benevolence throughout its realm. This is apprehension of what is true and normal in the administration of the natural world. The Spirit who, in the beginning, brooded over chaos, forming into cosmos, has never removed His incubating wings from the flaming eyrie of resolving matter. " By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens." The universe is a spiritual plenum.

The climax of primeval creation came when Jehovah Elohim, the doubly designated Spirit Creator, breathed into the nostrils of man " the breath of life, and man became a living soul." A claim entered in connection with this passage for a doctrine of spiritual biogenesis well might reopen the question already raised of the separate creation of man, and of the miracle played upon cell organism in his making; but that would take us afield from our present purpose. Moreover, the facts have been sufficiently affirmed.

That a type of personal inspiration prevailed from Abel to Noah is made evident in that part of the Genesis record already examined. From this record it appears equally clear that personal inspiration was attributed to a divine communion with Jehovah, as of spirit with spirit. The experience of Enoch is a conclusive example. "And Enoch *walked* with God." The Hebrew *halakh* (to walk), with the locative preposition, signifies close and intimate association. " Can two walk together," asks the prophet, " except they be agreed? " It was the Spirit's way in the primeval age. There were no open visions.

If this view of early Genesis inspiration be accepted (and there is no recourse except to reject the Book), it follows that, contemporary with the age of primeval enlightenment, and determinative of the intellectual alertness disclosed in the narrative, there obtained a dispensation of the Spirit as distinct, though not as general, as that which marked the later age, a premonition of Pentecost. This indicates not only the unity of the dispensations, but also the unity of the Written Word.

This conclusion is supported equally by the claims of the Old and the New Testaments. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews draws his bead-roll of saints through the median of antediluvian life from Abel to Noah. Also the Master testifies to the historicity of both Abel and Noah; and especially to the latter's Spirit-led faith in constructing the ark. This is passed up lightly by modern subjective criticism, which can see only a brute beginning of the race; and which places an order of low-browed troglodytes in the age which Genesis peoples with "mighty men, which were of old, men of renown." But let it be said once more, that whatever of troglodyte has been scientifically accounted for is a reversion from the older and central race type whose record is found in Genesis.

A trace of the Spirit's life and activity, significant of Scripture unity, may be seen in the choice made in Genesis of the appellative, *Jehovah,* in those passages where the reference is to covenant relations of early man with God, and where a revelatory contact is established. Admittedly, this does not always literally hold; but it obtains with such frequency and regularity as to indicate, as before affirmed, the use of a modal rule in composition. *Elohim,* let it be remembered, is the nature name of Deity, while *Jehovah* is the covenant title; as, also, though not exclusively, a title of the Spirit, the logic of the situation and the language generally indicating when the Third Person is meant, as in Genesis 1:2.

The now well-exploded hypothesis that the groupings of the divine names found in Genesis, and elsewhere, indicate late "source" writings has been replaced by conservative scholars with the more consistent belief that these groupings resulted from temperamental choices of the writer, or to the accidents of repeated sittings while composing. This still leaves room for the claim that the *Jehovah* groupings more frequently indicate a particular spiritual emphasis upon the passages so characterized. A few cases may be cited. Throughout the first chapter of Genesis, in connection with the account of material creation, *Elohim,* the nature name, is used, except that the name of the Spirit (*Ruakh*) occurs in the second verse. In the second chapter, beginning at the fourth verse, is introduced the account of the life instituted in Eden; of the giving of the commandment; of the acquisition of articulate and intelligent speech; and, though not in strict order, of the separate creation of woman. Logically, the covenant name of Jehovah is employed throughout the chapter; but, as though to emphasize the Spirit's office, *Elohim* is associated with it in the form, *Jehovah Elohim.*

In the third chapter, as before cited, an unusually instructive conjunction is encountered. In the drama of temptation, both the woman and the serpent use the nature name, *Elohim;* while the writer of the drama uses the covenant Spirit appellative of *Jehovah Elohim.* Let it be noted, too, that the appellative *Jehovah Elohim* is carried through the account of the expulsion from Eden, and the placing of the flaming sword at its gate. It is the Spirit who visits judgment. "Vengeance is mine saith Jehovah; I will repay."

In the fourth chapter of Genesis is the account of the birth of Abel, and of his acceptable offering; of the rejection and cursing of Cain. The covenant name

Jehovah consistently rules to the end of the narrative. But the two concluding verses (25, 26) tell of the birth of Seth and Enos, and also of the beginning of the public acknowledgment of Deity. The race had now swung into the light of common day; so, at the birth of Seth, *Elohim* was thanked for " another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew;" and this appellative continues through the genealogies to, and including, Noah. However (in verse 26), it is *Jehovah,* the covenant Spirit, and not *Elohim,* upon whom men begin to call. This discrimination could not have come of chance. The Spirit shaped His own utterance.

One citation more will suffice. The steady use of *Elohim* through the *toledoths,* thus indicating their super-venerable origin, is interrupted when the narrative takes up the general lapse of the race and the call of Noah. " But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah." The use of the name *Jehovah* signalized the institution of a new and better covenant.

I challenge the world of scholarship to say if the connections cited above be chance happenings in the process of redactorial putting together of " source " matter; and not genuine proofs of the directing presence of the Spirit with the writer. The passing of the " source " hypothesis makes room for a more reverent, as also for a more consistent, interpretation of the Written Word. I submit this contribution.

IV

THE POSTDILUVIAN AGE

THE age that extends from the traditional date of the flood to the dawn of cuneiform civilization is a pivotal age in ancient world history. During the passing of this age, the race was reborn; and then broke up into separate peoples and nations, which, in due time, were shifted to their allotted habitats. The transition into sub-racial groups was determined by climatic conditions, environment and the consequences of isolation. Diversities of speech were developed; while the beginnings of empire emerged from tribal rule. Some of the sub-races, far removed from the parent stock, degenerated, physically and otherwise, through the effects of climate and other unfriendly surroundings. This, as it now appears, was particularly so in Central and Western Europe, in the southward African zones, and in the lands eastward from the littorals of the great salt lakes of Western Asia. On the other hand, those segments of the race, notably the Semites, which clung to the original racial home, developed in the arts of civilization and in general primitive culture. The Bible gives us a swift, but coherent, account of this dividing of the earth amongst the descendants of Noah. As ethnology and comparative philology have developed the early human relationships of this age, the agreement of their facts with the account in Genesis has become a marvel of historic verisimilitude.

It must be borne in mind that the period in which Moses wrote was as distant from the period of the settlement of the postdiluvian races as is his period from ours. Without dependable data, how impossible would it be for us to conceive of the conditions existing in the time of Moses? Without certified materials, or complete inspiration, how could Moses have written a story of the ethnic settlement in the postdiluvian age which so completely fits in with now scientifically ascertained facts? Without such inspiration, or verified data, which have been disallowed critically, how could a *Jahvist*, eight hundred years after Moses, have sketched this crazy-quilt of world domiciliation? In its manifold preoccupation, critical science has neglected this field of proof. It remains for a final determinative of inquiry.

The student should know that not all the sections of the so-denominated Semitic race are direct descendants of Shem, the eldest son of Noah. The Semites, properly described, were those peoples of the early postdiluvian stock who formed the first and most powerful community of families, and longest held the original race habitat, in the terrane between Mount Ararat and Anti-Taurus. These mingled their blood, had one speech and preserved the *toledoths*, traditions and monotheistic faith of their antediluvian ancestors. Shem, as holding the family primogeniture, retained title to the fatherland. This proven composite character of the Semitic race is the final and death-blow to the old pragmatic theory that all the Semitic peoples came out of Arabia and were " Shemites " (whatever that may signify) in the strictest sense of racial derivation.

The collateral families of Noah's descendants early were scattered to the ends of the continents, and to the distant isles, some of them lapsing into conditions of savagery, and others diverging from the original family types. On these continental peripheries idolatry and fetichism appear to have sprung up, while yet the Semites clung to the paternal demesne, and remained monotheistic in religion. Undoubtedly, a Hamitic, or Turanian, people early entered the northern part of the Mesopotamian Plain (the southern part was probably, at this time, an uninhabitable morass), and became the progenitors of the Sumerians, idolaters, but renowned, whether correctly or incorrectly, as the inventors of cuneiform tablet writing.

So far as we are able, from subsequent history and ethnological identification, to locate the non-Semitic peoples of the postdiluvian migrations, the record of Genesis is fully corroborated. The Japhethites are assigned to the " isles of the Gentiles," which describes the islands and coastlands of the three great seas, the Mediterranean, the Black and the Caspian. Javan (Greece), Dodanim (Hellespontine Asia), Madai (Caspian Media), and Tubal (Euxine Caucasus) are fully accounted for, down to, and even after, classic times, with their Japhethic peoples, white races, including the Pelasgi (early Greeks), the Armenians, the Trojans, the Caucasians and other groups. Nothing is wanting in the exhibit. Within the century past, comparative philology has laid a line along these indications of Genesis, from Greece to the Punjaub, and on to the banks of the Ganges—the zodiac of Indo-European tongues.

There was a time, within the life of modern criticism, when objection would have been entered against the inclusion of the Greeks in this list of so venerable ethnological mention. But archæological research in Crete, and elsewhere in the Mediterranean circle, has carried Hellenic civilization, with a written language, back to more than two thousand years B. C. The facts of the Mediterranean and Caucasian settlements were known to Moses.

In dealing with the sons of Ham, the genealogist discriminates according to the fact already cited, namely, that the historic Semites were composed of different groups of the earlier generations of Noah's descendants. To Nimrod, a lineal descendant of Ham, is given the headship of Babylon, the most accentuated of all Semitic centralities. Nimrod is himself " Semitic " history incarnated. Canaan, the race father of the Amorites (Amurru), is also an eponymous name amongst the Semites, though of Hamitic blood. The lands of the Amorites are minutely described as stretching from Sidon to what became later the land of the Philistines, and on to Sodom and Gomorrah. The testimony of history and archæology to this raciality and its lands is an open chapter.

A peculiar interest attached to Canaan amongst the early genealogists. Though near the last in the order of early-born postdiluvians, his name is first mentioned, and with tokens that supply a direct corroboration of Scripture heraldry. "A servant of servants shall he (Canaan) be unto his brethren." "And he shall be his (Japheth's) servant." These prophecies extended through a long future; yet, after the first permanent settlement of the Babylonians in Mesopotamia, the Canaanites in the West Land became their subjects. Thus the descendants of Nimrod became masters over their elder kinsmen, the descendants of Canaan. If this citation should seem to be involved in the mazes of cuneiform testimony, we have only to turn to the history of Canaanitish subjection by the Israelites, as told in the book of Joshua. The whole nation of the Hivites, a Canaanitish people, submitted to become " hewers of wood and drawers of water " to the Israelites. Gradually, also, the remnants of the Canaanites, left after the conquest, settled into a state of servitude under their conquerors. Even the Sidonians throughout their history suffered vicissitudes of subjection and tribute paying to one or another of the stronger Semitic nations. As seafarers, they were always dependent upon the commercial patronage of their neighbours.

" Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem and Canaan shall be his servant." This double prophecy began to have an obvious fulfilment about the beginning of the seventh century B. C., when the united Japhethic kingdoms of Media and Persia began to overrun Elam, the easternmost territory of the Semitic people. This later included Babylon and Nineveh, in whose cities and palaces (tents) the Japhethic Persians took up a long reign, and brought into servitude the remaining remnants of the Canaanites to the very borders of the Great Sea. A further fulfilment obtained under the Macedonian (Japhethic) Empire of Alexander and that of his successors, during which time the Semitic lands were subjected and occupied. Particularly throughout Syria, the native Semites, of whatever families, were largely supplanted by Greek colonists, occupying the ancient cities of Shem, and using the natives as serfs and tribute payers. Corroboration hardly could be more complete. It is puerile and critically contemptible to say that the " source " pilferers of the post-exilic period could have known all these things. To suppose it is to necessitate a miracle of information as great as that of direct inspiration. But no revelation is naturally involved in the account given by Moses of the settlement of the Semitic and Japhethic peoples. The divisions of the continents to which they migrated, and the after development of history, confirm the Bible story.

No hint is given by Moses of the world division which fell to the descendants of Mizraim, the second son of Ham. The omission is significant. The name of Mizraim was indissolubly linked with Egypt. It was in Egypt that Genesis was first read. It was not necessary for the writer of Genesis to reiterate the facts of Egyptian ancesterhood. The truth here stands on its own ground.

When their Taurian birthland, stretching from " Mesha unto Sepher," could no longer contain them, the Semites began to break up into migratory masses, and move southward, through Celo Syria, toward the valleys, mountains and plains skirting the Euphrates and the shores of the Great Sea. If we followed the lines of the old theory of the Arabian origin of the Semites, and the priority of the Babylonians, it would seem logical to suppose that the first of these migratory waves flowing out of the Taurian hinterland was of those people who later settled in the Plain of Shinar; but this now can be admitted only in a somewhat modified sense. It is more in conformity with the indications of Genesis to suppose that a civilization antecedent to that of Babylon existed far to the northward, and that the first southward movement of the people representing this civilization was composed of all those potential groups that we now think of as Semites, that is to say, Amorites, Babylonians, Zidonians, Hebrews and, lastly, Arabs. With this conclusion the monuments agree, so far as they speak a positive voice.

This mass, moving southward, was arrested by the barriers of Lebanon. After a millennium, or less, a second fission took place, and it was then that the Babylonians entered the Mesopotamian Plain, as Genesis describes. This migration across the Euphrates was not accomplished at once; but the infiltration of West Land peoples into Babylonia continued for centuries. At times, if not for a long period following the invasion, authority remained with the West Land, as the monuments show, and as the record in Genesis makes reasonable.

The attention of conservative critics now turns to this basic West Land civilization as furnishing a complete answer to many of the fanciful and pragmatic questions raised against the Old Testament.

The cuneiform inscriptions speak of a region known as Amurru, which in very early times is seen to be acting upon Babylon in the way of migratory invasions and fitful conquests. Roughly outlined, Amurru contained all trans-Jordan Syria, an indefinite northward reach of what was later Hittite territory, the Lebanon region, Phœnicia, Palestine, and almost certainly the Sinaitic Peninsula. This region was otherwise known as the West Land, in some portion of which was the earliest seat of the northern Semites, as distinguished from the Arabs, or southern branch of that race.

It was, as we have seen, an essential part of the older critical hypothesis, that the original Babylonians came from northern Arabia, and that the Abrahamic family migrated from the same region to Ur of the Chaldees. This hypothesis assumed that Palestine, Phœnicia, and Eastern Syria were also peopled from Arabia. With this went the idea that whatever civilization early prevailed in the West Land was built upon a floor of Bedouin ignorance and general cultural degradation. The rise of the West Land from barbarism, so the critics contended, was due to the influence of Babylon, which often held its countries in military subjection. The Hebrews, who later thrust themselves, through conquest, into West Land territory, also, according to the critics, borrowed their literature, as their religious and ethical ideals, from Babylon. How completely this view has held sway every student of critical literature knows. It has put the Bible at the mercy of a scholastic theory. But the light breaks.

The Abrahamic family was not of Bedouin origin. It did not come out of Arabia, nor did it migrate to Babylonia from a semi-barbaric country. It came from a region of enlightened conditions, a region which gave to Babylon its original Semitic stock, as also its religious culture, which, however, Babylon early suffered to become polytheized through Sumerian influence. The West Land habitat of the original Hebrew stock has not been located definitely. It, however, certainly was not that part of Amurru known as Canaan, afterwards assigned by Jehovah to Abraham and his offspring, but was a region much to the northward. Possibly it was a province of the Hittite empire at the time of that people's greatest power. Professors Sellin, Ungnad, and others incline to the opinion that it may have impinged upon the geographical confines of Asia Minor. Either Mitanni or Anti-Lebanon is possible. Genesis seems to indicate a still more northern locality. But wherever this fatherland, it was one that stood in the blaze of ancient culture and at the median of such monotheistic traditions as survived from the earliest postdiluvian times. It is upon this point that argument is to be concentrated.

Several circumstances point to the near Lebanon terrane as the quarter from which moved the earliest Semitic migration into Babylonia. This movement could have occurred hardly before the middle of the fifth millennium B. C. The earliest date that can be assigned to the reign of Sargon is a thousand years later. A geological authority has suggested that no considerable part of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley had become inhabitable before some time in the sixth millennium, and at least a millennium must be allowed to the prior exclusive occupancy of the Sumerians. Only slight attention has been given to this theory of the comparatively recent habitable condition of the Mesopotamian alluvium; and yet it is of the highest value as an argument, and has been enhanced by the observations recently made possible by the excavation test wells sunk through the deposits at Ur. The effect of the theory will be to eliminate Babylonia as a possible site of the Garden of Eden, or even as the near birthplace of the human race. That birthplace must be looked for in a region much to the northward of Babylonia.

That the earliest Semites in Babylon went from the Lebanon region is testified to correlatively in the Scriptures and in the monuments. This is read both in the direction taken by the people in their journey and in the name given to the first city which they built in the plain of Shinar. Genesis 11:2 says, "And it came to pass, as the people journeyed eastward, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and there they dwelt." Our Authorized Version reads, " from the east," but that is contrary to its own rendering at 2:3 and 3:24. But at 13:11, where the same assimilated prepositional form (*miqqidehm*) is used, the rendering and the sense are in harmony. But the meaning of *qidehm* is " before " or " forward " without reference to geographical relation—“ as the people went forward.” The sense supports the idea of the Amurru or Lebanon origin of the Babylonian Semites. The journey eastward to Babylon from any other region than Lebanon would be quite impossible, geographically considered. Also migration from Arabia to Babylon would be neither eastward nor from the east, but rather northward. This manifestly makes Arabia impossible as the fatherland of the Babylonian Semites.

It is proved from the monuments that El was an ancient Amorite, or West Land, designation of Deity. The name of the city and tower built in the plain of Shinar was Babel (Bab-El, “ the gate of God ”). The West Land Semites, going eastward into Shinar, carried with them the worship of the one God, known to them as El. Him they honoured in the name of their first capital. It also has been shown that Amorites either built or early occupied Ur of the Chaldees. These may have been allied to the earliest Hebrews. Indeed, it is possible that a clue is to be found in the name “ Chaldee ” (Hebrew, *Kasdim*). This may go back to Habiri (conceivably *Chabirim*), a term for Heberites, or Hebrews, an echo from the Tel-el-Amarna and the Bhogaz-Koi tablets. Certainly the Abrahamic family migrated to Ur as to a colony of their countrymen, if not of their tribal kinsmen. But, however this may have been, the proof of an Amorite original of the first Semitic colony at Ur is at hand.

Professor Clay has shown that Ur is but another way of writing El, the God of Amurru. The Cuneiform phonetics for Ur are *'wr*, which, with the aleph sign written out, becomes *awar*. The West Land and the Babylonian speeches replace *w* with *m*. This process would give Amur (ru), which seems conclusive; at least it is ninety-nine per cent safer than the argument on which the Babylonists have hung the myth origin theory of the stories of the Old Testament.

I think it a safe proposition that El was the most ancient title of Deity known to the undivided Semitic race, and that it was the symbol of the monotheistic faith of the immediate descendants of Noah. The compound El-elyon, " Most High God," was ancient in Palestine before the time of Abraham. Moreover, the title is preserved in the Genesis form, Elohim, which expresses a theological concept anterior and extraneous to the Hebrew language consciousness and is indeed the cosmic and nature name of the Creator, and is so used in Genesis. The critical post-dating of the first chapter of Genesis as compared with the second chapter is contradicted in the archaic Elohim and in its setting of ancient idioms and phrasings. Doubtless these phrasings were in use by mankind when " the whole earth was one lip and one tongue." *El* was the sacred appellative in Semitic monotheism, a millennium, and more, before the gods of Babylon had a Semitic worshipper.

Very recent decipherment of cuneiform documents shows that Ishtar, the chief goddess of the Babylonians, was an Amorite queen in the fourth millennium B. C. Her chief city was at Aleppo, where Professor

Clay has with much probability located the capital of the empire of Amurru. Aleppo was far to the westward of Babylon. The king consort of Ishtar was Tammuz, whose palace was amongst the cedars of Lebanon. Gilgamesh, the hero of the greatest of the Babylonian epics, was of Amorite affinity. Hammurapi, the lawgiver and, after Sargon, the greatest of all the kings of Babylon, was an Amorite. I have in my possession a tablet of the time of Gimil-Sin (2315 B. C.). The name of this king is Amorite, with a theogonic hyphenation. This Gimil-Sin had close relationship with West Land affairs and traditions. Professor Clay identified as Amorite nearly all the names of the ten kings of the Babylonian reputed antediluvian list, from which, as the critics allege, the ten antediluvian patriarchs of Genesis are derived. But the grotesque heraldry of the Babylonian list is a corruption of the original of the Genesis account. Fable and invention are suggested by both the Babylonian name list and its chronology. Besides, Babylon, according to already quoted geological authority, could have had no antediluvian history except such as it borrowed from the West Land.

All the above citations have a direct bearing on the question of Bible origins. But there is a still more important argument in favour of the West Land as the original, or at least the secondary, home of all the Genesis traditions. The territory first occupied by the descendants of Noah may be placed between the middle western part of Armenia and the Taurus Mountains. From that region the patriarchal traditions travelled southward with the Lebanon highlands as an axis. These traditions were monotheistic.

The proof of this converges on three ascertained monotheistic centres, namely: Salem, the sanctuary of Melchizedek, in Palestine; the shrine of Jethro, in Midian; and the court of Mitanni in the north. The worship of Salem was that of El-elyon, "The Most High God," who was freely sacrificed to by Abraham. In Midian, Moses served as the archdeacon of Jethro, whose cult was also monotheistic, and who almost certainly knew Jehovah under the name of Elohim. This, in fact, is clearly inferable from Exodus 18 (see particularly v. 10). As to the monotheism of Mitanni, the evidence is wholly of the tablets, but is of a trustworthy character. Amenophis IV. of Egypt, the collector of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, was a monotheist, abolished the polytheism of Egypt during his reign, and established the worship of one God in all the temples of the land. According to good authority, Amenophis derived his monotheism from his mother and his wife, who were princesses of the kingdom of Mitanni. This was in the first half of the second millennium B. C. Mummies of members of the family of these princesses have been recognized as of Semitic type; so that of whatever blood the populace of Mitanni may have been, the ruling house at this time was Semitic and in possession of at least a form of the original Semitic monotheism.

I am now minded to recapitulate the argument for a northwest, or Anti-Taurus, origin of ancient world civilization, and particularly for such a habitat of the original Semitic traditions as are represented in the Old Testament. In doing this I shall have respect to the following order of discussion: (1) the Biblical and ethnic argument; (2) the argument of comparative literature; (3) the philological argument; (4) the argument of exclusion; and (5) the argument of critical hesitancy and confusion.

1. It goes without saying that the ethnical aspects of the early postdiluvian world, represented in the Genesis *toledoths,* or genealogy tables, are little in favour with criticism of the type with which we are dealing. The preconceived theory of this contention is unfriendly to the idea of accepting any of the early statements of Genesis as dependable history. Everything Biblical must be depreciated and questioned as much as possible, that it may be subordinated to the demands of pan-Babylonism. But the Bible argument continually acquires strength on the very basis upon which unfriendly criticism has demanded that it be made to stand, namely, the development of fact through the application of the rule of comparative records and the science of history. Thus the inferential Genesis grouping of the original Semitic families in the terrane between the Ararat and the Taurus Mountains is continually receiving support through the development of ethnological and archæological knowledge. What information has been acquired through the former channel gives us the impression of a slow southward and eastward movement of Semitic groups; while the increased light which has been shed on the Hittite problem suggests that people as having acted

as a clearance force in pushing the last remnant of the Semites out of their original habitat into Syria and contiguous lands. In the earliest Bible records, in which mutual reference is made to Hittites and Amorites, this process is seen to be in the last stages of completion.

What further light may be shed on the identity of Amurru from a future and more certain understanding of Hittite history and monuments constitutes a matter of signal interest to all students of Bible science. But enough already is known to justify the belief that the Hittite empire finally and completely succeeded to the territory earliest occupied by the Semitic people. Professor Clay argued, though not over-insistently, for the existence of a great Amorite empire in this former Semitic homeland, with Aleppo as metropolis or capital. There is not lacking an argument for the support of this contention, though the important point involved, the earlier than Babylon origin of the Hebrew traditions of the Old Testament, is not dependent upon the theory of such an Amorite empire. Professor Clay's alternative, an Amorite influence, or an association of Semitic family groups in those earlier centuries, will fully meet the logic of the case.

It is now clear from a proper understanding of the Hebrew text of Genesis 11:2, that the Semites who went into Shinar and founded Babylon were of a stock from the Taurian Ararat region. It is equally clear that they were followed or immediately preceded by a Semitic migration which either founded or appropriated the city of Ur and the then near-by coast of the

Persian Gulf. That these were followed in later centuries, and from the same general region, by the early progenitors of the Hebrew race is a conclusion which is coming to be accepted by the best judgment of modern scholarship. This judgment equally agrees that the eponyms of the Abrahamic family represented a culture and a tradition of great antiquity. Recent excavations at Ur speak unmistakably of a syncretism of culture centred there and going back to a time which must antedate the life of Babylon. This is evidence of a civilization which was a common Semitic heritage in the first home of the race before either Babylon or Ur had come into existence. The concomitants of this civilization, by every token, were the originals of the Hebrew traditions of Abraham and Moses.

2. There is no point at which the Babylonist theory of Bible origins limps so definitely as in the test of comparative literature; that is, the comparison of the literature of Genesis and the literature of the Babylonian epics. In The Aftermath Series I have contrasted at some length the Creation Tablet of Assurbanipal and the first chapter of Genesis. It is impossible to read the two without being impressed with certain points of resemblance. It is also impossible to bring the two together without being impressed with the tremendous differences between them. To me, nothing can seem clearer than that the likenesses to the Hebrew narrative found in the Babylonian story are such as survived the adumbrating influence of Sumerian polytheism; while the differences describe the almost com-

plete corruption of the primeval tradition, as carried by the Semites into Shinar.

I also here call attention to a fact which, so far as I have observed, has escaped the notice of critics, namely, that the points of resemblance in the Babylonian and Hebrew stories relate to incidental and unimportant elements in the epics, while the differences have to do with what is germane and essential to the statement of polytheism. In the *enuma elish,* or Creation Tablet story, as I have shown in a former chapter, the abyss, or Tiamat, exists before the creation of the gods. Through the mingling of the waters the eldest of the gods come into being. These gods rebel against Tiamat and her compeers, Apsu and Mumu. Thereupon Tiamat prepares to reduce them to obedience. Marduk (at one time it is Asshur), one of the younger gods, is put forward to contend with the monster, Tiamat. Slaying her, he divides her body in halves, from which, and her blood, he creates the lands, the waters, and the firmament. From the blood of the god Kingu, offspring of Tiamat, the race of men is created.

This is the substance of the Babylonian story. We cannot better express an opinion of its inaneness and lack of comparative point than by repeating the sentiment expressed by Wardle, namely, to suppose that the Genesis account of creation was reduced from this hodge-podge of polytheism and moral grossness is the height of absurdity. Nevertheless, the conviction remains that the two literatures somewhere touched a common basis of consciousness and knowledge. Not the brief period of the Babylonian exile could have furnished this basis. The moral and literary differences are too vast and profound for so radical a recension as the critics suppose. A millennium or even two millenniums before the founding of Babylon would better suggest the age in which the two stories existed as a common tradition.

What is above observed concerning the Babylonian Creation Tablets applies in all essential particulars to the Babylonian literature touching the Garden of Eden and the Fall. In fact, there is, properly speaking, no literature in the Babylonian anthologies describing a paradise and the origin of sin. What makes reference to such matters is not worthy of being so classified. The myth of Adapa, the so-called "Adam" of the Babylonian cycle, represented on one of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and evidently well known in the West Land, as also the serpent cylinder, are without point when laid beside the account of the first temptation as given in Genesis. The Gilgamesh epos, in which occurs the account of a flood, is really possessed of some points of resemblance to the Genesis account of the deluge; but the observations made concerning the Creation Tablets apply with equal force to the Gilgamesh, namely, the elements of resemblance are unimportant, while the differences go to the ultimate of everything essential to either story.

3. I have already referred to the form *El*, as, in all probability, being the original Semitic appellation of monotheistic Deity. It is interesting to note with what zeal this suggestion has been attacked by radical

scholars and even by those who, though of a more conservative view, yet seem to feel that they must defend the hypothesis of a priestly-prophetic origin of Genesis. The effort to show that *El* is not a proper name is without conclusive result. The Semitic languages do not finely discriminate in this matter. With necessary vowel changes, the syllable *el* appears in all the Semitic languages. Its grammatical origin and relations are not of so much consequence as its use. Its grammatical peculiarities are in fact an additional proof of its having been anciently employed in the sense indicated in a former paragraph of this work. As *el, ila, ilu, allah* it has been a divine appellative from unannalled Semitic times down to the age of Mohammed. Finally, it may be said that authorities like Lagrange and Baentsch insist that *El* was from ancient times used as a proper noun. Friedrich Delitzsch was also committed to this view.

4. Every candid investigator must admit that, after the remotely kindred elements in the Hebrew and Babylonian creation and flood documents have been separated to themselves and non-related elements have been excluded, there is little left of which to predicate a comparison. It has been the fashion to emphasize every aspect of the Babylonian stories which offers even a precarious resemblance to Genesis; but this *finesse* has been detected by students in general, and so the drift away from the theory of Hebrew dependence has been accelerated. The resemblances pragmatically insisted upon by Delitzsch have practically proved the end of the extreme form of the

hypothesis. The remaining protagonists are choosing what ground they can.

5. We now come to apply to the issue our final argument, that of the hesitancy and confusion of the critics as to the method of dealing with the theory of dependence. There seems to be no certain agreement on any point. At this juncture, it is especially interesting to note that some who reject the theory of Hebrew dependence are in complete confusion as to having any notion of how and when the Genesis stories came into existence. Two difficulties seem to beset such investigators. First, the Amurru doctrine is too bold and too new to convince; and there is still a fettering of their processes by reason of their long obsession with the post-exilic *quellen* hypothesis, or "source" theory. But even this has its compensations. The present situation represents a temporary *impasse.* The Amurru or pre-Hittite door is the only way of ingress into the house of this truth. The time between Moses and the exile, considered from any human viewpoint, is too short and too lacking in traditional perspective to have produced the Genesis stories and *toledoths.*

V

THE AGE OF THE PATRIARCHS

THE climax of ancient history came with the making of a covenant by Jehovah with Abraham. This is the point of the going out of the Pentateuch from an all-world story to that of a chosen people. The accepted date of the call of Abraham is around the year 2000 B. C. Archæology has pushed its discoveries well back into the millenniums preceding the birth of Abraham. While these discoveries do not bear always directly on the history of the Pentateuch, wherever they touch that history the effect is to confirm it, or else to illuminate the locative force of its statements. Tablets retrieved at Ur, and in the region intermediate, stretching toward Haran, uniformly point to such conditions as are suggested in the Biblical narrative of Abraham. In 1926, I brought back from Jerusalem, and placed in the museum of Duke University, eight cuneiform tablets recovered from the strata of Ur, and indicating the reign of Gimal-Sin (2125(?) B. C.). These tablets, read by Dr. Böhl, of the University of Groningen, reflect an age in agreement with that presented to us in the Abrahamic section of Genesis. Archæology has brought to light dwellings, and has noted customs, in which, and amongst which, the lives of Abraham and Sarah well could have been lived.

The efforts of critics to class the patriarchs as mythical or half mythical characters, and their names as signifying mere eponymous relationship to ancient tribes, are peurile in the face of the accumulating results of archæological science. It is like denying the light of stars in the sky of an unclouded night. Abraham and Jacob are as historically real as Martin Luther or John Wesley.

The point at which archæology definitely and conclusively is destined to pick up the life history of Abraham is Shechem, the Amorite capital which the patriarch chose for the first stage of his residence in the land of promise. The results already achieved at Shechem have affected Bible criticism radically. The spirit of Abraham is there. I have elsewhere adverted to the fact that Abraham was drawn to Shechem through the urge of its monotheistic shrine, the temple of El-berith; but the matter is worthy of further emphasis. I do not doubt that, during the excavations of 1926, in passing through the exhumed tower gate of Shechem, I daily walked over the selfsame pavement stones once trodden by Abraham in his goings in and comings out, nor am I less certain that, within the excavated temenos of the temple of El-berith, I stood on a spot where Abraham stood when he offered sacrifice to the covenant God. But certain direct tokens of Abraham remain buried at Shechem, and only await the work of recovery. When the Bible-exalting excavations at that ancient site shall have been completed, " the sepulchre which Abraham bought of Emmor the father of Shechem," deep in the limestone loins of Gerezim, will yield not only tablets of the day of Abraham; but also, I have faith to believe, twelve stone mummy coffins brought out of Egypt, those of Joseph and his eleven brethren. (See Acts 7:15, 16.)

Salem (Jerusalem) and Melchizedek, its priest king, are most interestingly associated with Abraham's record in Genesis; and archæology has so linked itself with this part of the patriarch's narrative and has so illuminated it as to become testimony to its historical trustworthiness. With the story of Melchizedek goes that of the four kings mentioned in Genesis 14, Amraphel, Arioch, Chederlaomer and Tidal. Of these, Chederlaomer, king of Elam, was overlord or king in chief. These kings, somewhere about the beginning of the second millennium B. C., made war in the southern reaches of El Ghor and about Mt. Seir and Kadesh. In their foray, they sacked the city of Sodom and carried away Lot, the nephew of Abraham, with his household and his goods. Abraham, leading his servants and a friendly force besides, pursued after and defeated them, bringing back his kinsman and his belongings.

This record has been attacked often by the critics, chiefly from two points: the historicity of the four kings, and the possibility of a king of Elam having made war in the Jordan land as early as the time of Abraham. But archæology has supplied more than a reasonable answer to these objections. Nearly all scholars identify Amraphel with Hammurapi, king of Babylon, and author of the code which goes by his name, now familiar to all students of Bible history. Chederlaomer has been validated as Kudur-lagamar, an Elamite king and a successor of Kudur-nahunta, clearly attested by the monuments as conqueror of eastern Babylonia and overlord of the West Land (Phœnicia and Palestine). Professor Clay is authority for the statement that the Elamite kings, as shown by the monuments, make this claim. Kudur-mabug was the immediate successor of Kudur-nahunta, Kudur-lagamar following. " Kudur " (*Cheder* in Hebrew) was a name title of Elamite kings as " Pharaoh " was of the kings of Egypt.

The identification of Amraphel with Hammurapi puts the age of Abraham a century or more earlier than is generally reckoned, a dating which is favoured by the situation developed at Shechem. This change of a hundred years in the date of Abraham is not, however, a matter of significance, which is immediately evident when it is remembered that critical science has always been timorous about the chronology between the reign of Sargon (3800 or 3500 B. C.) and the age of Abraham.

But to sum up. Archæology supports the historicity of the four kings of Genesis 14, and with this goes also the overlordship of Chederlaomer, the Elamite. The independency of Hammurapi in the kingdom of Babylon, and the setting up of his famous code, therefore, came after the removal of Abraham from Ur. The dependableness of the Genesis story is beyond question.

Radical criticism has generally rated Melchizedek as a myth, and chiefly because of the title given him in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life." Archæology has furnished a very simple solution of this mystery. The Tell-el-Amarna tablets, about three centuries later, give this title, and in almost identical language, to Ebed-Hepa, a subject king of Jerusalem, under Amenophis IV. of Egypt. At this time Amenophis ruled over the greater part of Palestine, including Jerusalem. This Ebed-Hepa, being pressed by hostile neighbours, wrote many letters to Amenophis, begging for soldiers to protect the king's dependencies. Some of these letters are included in the Tell-el-Amarna collection. In several of these Ebed-Hepa uses this remarkable language concerning himself: "Neither my father, nor my mother (not my descent, beginning of days nor length of life) set me in this place; the mighty arm of the king caused me to enter into the house of my father."

It is clear that Jerusalem (Salem) was not under the sway of the Elamites in the time of Abraham. Chederlaomer and his confederates, in their raid, did not enter the highlands of southern Canaan. The reason of this was that Jerusalem was even then under Egypt, and Melchizedek was a subject prince of Pharaoh. As such, he reigned under the same feudal title as Ebed-Hepa, three hundred years later. The Pharaohs of that period were of the Hyksos dynasty, by blood and speech kindred to the Hebrews, and monotheists, as well. Hence the protection and religious privileges enjoyed by Melchizedek and his monotheistic subjects at Salem; hence also the welcome given Abraham by Pharaoh in Egypt.

The archæology of Sodom exhibits strong confirmatory evidences of the trustworthiness of the Genesis narrative. Sodom was long the peculiar aversion, not to say the favourite jest, of radical criticism. Nöldecke, long ago, consigned it, along with the " four kings," to the limbo of unhistorical things. Sodom is nevertheless a fact; and both geology and archæology have risen up to testify to its historicity. Professors Emerson, Wright and Blanckenhorn, eminent geologists, at different times, and in independent investigations, confirmed the impressions given us of the region by the account of Genesis. The former particularly says: " Sulphur deposited by many hot springs is abundant in the clay, and bitumen oozes from every crevice of the rock, and every earthquake dislodges great sheets of it from the bottom of the lake." " The region," says Dr. Kyle, who carefully explored it, " is a great stratum of rock salt, capped by sulphur bearing marls and conglomerates cemented by bitumen." Such an earthquake as that supposed by Professor Emerson precipitated the overthrow and holocaust of Sodom in the time of Abraham.

All geologists and archæologists are agreed that the rise in the level of the waters of the Dead Sea through the deposit of detritus by the inflow of the Jordan has covered the greater part of the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah. Dr. Kyle, in 1924, fully settled this fact, finding that " the ruined cities had hid their shame in a few feet of water and mud." Yet he was happy in locating, slightly above the water level, the high place, Bab-ed-Dra'a, the temple and necropolis of Sodom, whose pottery told perfectly and fully of a civilization of the early bronze age, and circumstantially of that of the eighteenth century B. C., exactly tallying with the date of the Genesis account of the overthrow of the doomed cities of the plain.

The age of Jacob, including the period of Joseph's rule in Egypt, promises eventually to supply proofs of highest value in connection with Old Testament history and criticism. These proofs, when fully developed, through excavations and collation of materials, will centre mainly at three points, namely, first, at Shechem, the Amorite capital, where Jacob resided for thirteen years, or more; second, in the hinterland of Beersheba and Kadesh, in connection with the Habiri, or Kenites; and, third, in Egypt, in connection with the Pharonic granaries in the Pelusian terrane of Zoan.

The civic and religious record of Jacob began at Bethel. A personal survey of the traditional site of Jacob's vision, made in 1926, brought me to the confident conclusion that its memory well and correctly has been kept. Fragments of limestone laminæ lie about the hilltop space, which is still well shaded, and marked by an apartness suggesting nocturnal quietness and safety. To the use of one who must choose a stone for his pillow these laminæ are admirably adapted; not over thick, flat, fairly smooth, and without sharpness of grain. Also being flat and of approximating dimensions, they lend themselves to hasty pillar building. And what was my interest and surprise to find that the Moslems of the neighbourhood had built up such pillars, three to four feet in height, and painted their tops with a pigment of red, evidently to signify fire, and in commemoration of the act of the patriarch.

Nearby the rest of Jacob was the site of the altar of calf worship, later set up by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin; but one, because of the tokens still abiding, feels that this sanctuary of the patriarch was never invaded or desecrated by idolatry in any form. Angels of silence and awe are therefrom and thereupon descending and ascending as of old.

That period of the life of Jacob which makes possible contact with archæology begins in Padan-aram, " the house of Laban." Perhaps it may come to pass in a future time that some archæologist, sounding in the soil of " the land of the people of the East," may strike upon the cobble-gorged throat of the well from which Jacob watered the sheep of Laban in the hour in which he first saw the face of his fair cousin Rachel. In default of such discovery, no archæological token in Jacob's experience will precede those of Shechem, the true centrifugal of Old Testament history.

However, the monuments are not silent concerning the name of " Jacob," as also that of " Joseph," in the age preceding and following that of the patriarch. Tablets of the Ur dynasty carry the names " Jacob-el " and " Joseph-el," indicating a monotheistic relationship. As in the case of the name of Abraham, this deciphering from the tablets of the names of Jacob and Joseph in the region of Ur, though not to be linked with the patriarch and his son, is of very high collateral value. But of a much more direct value is the use of the names of the grandson and the great-grandson of Abraham on the monuments of the Egyptian period. These monuments indicate that there existed in Palestine, during the middle years of the Egyptian bondage, two towns known, respectively, as "Jacob-ta" and "Joseph-ta." The names of these towns are referable directly to Jacob and Joseph; and probably were immediately on the caravan route between Egypt and Assyria. Also the name "Israel" is testified to by these monuments as having existed in Palestine two hundred years before the exodus. Many and curious theories of criticism have arisen from this fact; but it also is bound up in the history of the Habiri, of whom I shall speak presently, only here observing that "Israel" and "Habiri," in this connection, are equivalent terms.

The story of Jacob at Shechem, as given in the Scriptures, makes several archæological contacts, namely, with a village called Shalem, before Shechem; with the well of Jacob in the Vale of Shechem; with the palace of Hamor, father of Shechem; with the sepulchre which Abraham bought of Hamor; with the altar El-el-ohe-Israel; and, inferentially, with the temple El-berith, the last named being the most ancient and characteristic ruin yet uncovered in Palestine. The world of scholarship has not awakened fully to the significance of these ruins, nor to the value of the work done in their exhumation. At a single stroke, this work has demonstrated the historicity of the patriarchs and illuminated the record of theocratic Israel.

Shalem (or Salem) is the place to which Jacob came when he halted before Shechem. Its site is doubtful (if it be not an abstract idea) and could, in itself, be of little evidential value, since Jacob would have tarried there no longer than was necessary to complete his negotiations with the Shechemites. But it is worthy of more than passing note that local Arabs are reported of as giving the name of Shalem to a village huddle about some ancient remains at a distance of one to one and one-half kilometers from Shechem. I passed it, while surveying, in 1926, the route of Jacob from the ford of the Jordan, through the Vale of Cherith, to the foot of Mount Ebal.

The well of Jacob is the best attested Bible landmark in Palestine; and is the archæological pivot in the history of the patriarchs. Its sinking was one of the considerable achievements of antiquity. It is seven, or more, feet in diameter, and was dug through obdurate limestone to a depth of eighty-five feet. The work could have required little less than two years, since no more than two men could occupy the throat at one time, and they working in shifts with crude picks of the early iron or later bronze age. This well of water commands the Shechem situation, and is placed exactly where the letter and spirit of the story demand that it should be.

No reference is made in the Genesis record of Jacob to the tower of Shechem; but, as already indicated, I am fully convinced that the foundations of the tower and gate of Shechem, uncovered in 1926, are none other than those which existed in the times of Abraham and Jacob; and this is the more certainly established in the fact that the palace at Shechem, which is directly connected with Jacob and his sons in the story of the deflowering of Dinah, was found to communicate directly with the tower gate. The palace foundation, when fully exposed, gave evidence that the palace itself had been plundered, and its clay brick superstructure violently thrown down. In other foundations than those of the palace, artifacts and relics were found; but the royal preserves were bare, a mute proof of the Genesis story that the house of Hamor had been pillaged and robbed by the sons of Jacob.

The temenos, or plaza, of the temple of El-berith, yielded, on the one side, a huge stone altar; and, on the other, the base and fallen plinth of a limestone monument of commanding design. Dr. Sellin does not hesitate to associate the first of these with Jacob's altar, nor the second with Joshua's memorial stone. If these identifications hold, and there is no serious ground for doubt, not only has been thrown, through the prism of archæology, upon the days of Jacob and Joshua, the open light of history, but a new meaning has been given to Shechem and its shrine of shrines, the temple of El-berith. The light of this discovery shines backward through postdiluvian and antediluvian times, as well as forward through the theocratic history of Israel. By its token, the temple of El-berith was built as a monotheistic seat near the time of the earliest beginning of Semitic empire in Babylon, and will gloriously testify to the truth of the oldest of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The identification of the Habiri of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets with the descendants of the probably eight thousand retainers of the Abraham-Isaac-Jacob camp of Syrians left by Jacob in the hinterland of Beersheba, at the time of his going with his immediate family into Egypt, is a theory first sponsored by myself, as a result of conclusions reached through discoveries and studies at Shechem. In a general way, it is shared by dependable continental scholars, and is destined to become a point of going out in Pentateuchal criticism. The wholeness and integrity of the Jacob story receive from it a tremendous contribution. That these Habiri were eventually incorporated into the body of Israel as Kenites, and later, sometimes known as Rechabites, is one of the compensations of Bible narrative.

The Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings, of Semitic race and religion were the ruling Pharaohs of Egypt during the period of the overlordship of Joseph. This kinship of blood and religion helps to explain the ease with which Joseph won the favour of Pharaoh and acceded to power in his house. These Hyksos Pharaohs had their seat at Zoan, on the Tanic arm of the Nile, near the northern border of Egypt. There we naturally look for remains testifying to their occupancy.

Petrie, Naville and other Egyptologists have uncovered ruins in this region which give the expected testimony. In 1905, Petrie exposed the area of a camp or royal settlement, at a point about twenty miles north of Cairo, which carried evidence of Hyksos rulership. The architecture, pottery, and else, corroborated the Hyksos tradition. Also, here, as elsewhere, are evidences of co-extant storehouses, such as those into which Joseph gathered grain against the years of famine. Indeed, by the canons of reckoning, chronology and corroborative fact, the ruins of Joseph's granaries are represented in these finds.

The pivotal relationship of Jacob to the problems of Old Testament interpretation and criticism justifies a somewhat detailed study of his character and activities. This relationship will be found to reach to such elemental Pentateuchal questions as the ideal of the theocracy and the unity of the shrine and the secular authority, or the simultaneous institution in the wilderness of the sacrifice and the Mosaic law, which, at a glance, the practiced Bible student will recognize as the crux of Old Testament criticism. The historicity of Jacob, on the basis of the Genesis record, being established, the way to a critical proof of ancient Scripture unity becomes clear.

The birthright for which Jacob struggled, even in prenatal unconsciousness, and which he at last secured through superior acumen, if still by means not overscrupulous, was not a mere title to primogeniture, but was the personal incarnation of a racial ideal that looked to the correlatives of spiritual apprehension and political mastery. The national shrine and the framework of the state in the unity of the theocracy described the most ancient programme of Israel; and

Jacob was its first distinct exponent, as Shechem was the place where, in his initiative, the earliest attempt was made to realize it. That attempt had continuity; it was not a fortuitous circumstance that Joshua, after the conquest, gathered the people together at Shechem to take up the programme of Jacob in proclaiming the realization of the ideal of the shrine and the state. Shechem was to have been what Jerusalem later became, the seat of government and worship, and had been so, except for unforeseen tribal dissonance.

Of the primal concerns of Israel, political authority and the cultic ritual, the political was always the more distinct and constant; but the cultic or spiritual was counted as pre-eminent, and also as forming the condition upon which the political was to be realized and maintained. In spiritual perception Jacob may have been an adolescent, and this perforce of his time; but he was strong in spiritual potentialities, and from the beginning was apt in the qualities of foresight and material mastery. This outline of his figure grows more distinct in the light of the uncoverings at Shechem.

The twenty years which Jacob spent in the house of Laban at Padan-aram developed his aptitude in the handling of his own material fortunes, as it also deepened his religious sense, a slowly enlarging and settling conception of the unity and spirituality of the Deity. His was not a struggle out of fetichism or polytheism into monotheism, but a struggle to retain the concept of that primal and elemental monotheism which had descended to him through family transmissions from the earliest traditions of the Semitic races. We now must see that it was this struggle that brought the rupture with Laban, and eventuated in the trek toward the fatherland. It also was this struggle that culminated in the vision at Peniel, and that eventually, through his new impulses, led him to Shechem instead of to the Beersheba hinterland, as had been his purpose.

No analysis of Jacob's motive, as no appraisement of his history, would be complete without taking into account his sudden change of plan at the Jabbok ford. That change of plan was the result of a cumulative experience. The desert silences through which he passed from the house of Laban to the hill of Peniel, so favourable to contemplation and mental quickening, turned the Canaanward journey into a progressive revelation. The balsam trees of Mt. Gilead burned with tokens of coming mystery, while angels of challenge stepped from impinging mirages.

At Padan-aram Jacob had become a feudal householder of much wealth and importance. His holdings and personal station were of such glamour as to provoke from his envious kinsmen the description, " all this glory." It is evident from the face of the Bible narrative that Jacob sought the building up of his material fortunes not as an end, but as a means. He was ever a stranger in the land of his exile; his heart and his ideals belonged to the land of promise; his birthright, bought as the price of a long banishment, was never forgotten. Years before his stealing away from Laban he had separated himself into a distinct habitat and had there set up an authority of his own.

It is safe to say that, at the time of his setting forth from Padan-aram, Jacob's pastoral household, inclusive of his harem, consisted of scarcely fewer than two thousand souls. Abraham had been able to raise from the servants of his household, born and trained in his own camp, three hundred and eighteen fighting men. The safe military rule of five civilians to each war-capable male would show the community of Abraham to have consisted of fifteen hundred and ninety souls. It can easily be shown that the retainers of Jacob at the Jabbok exceeded this number. The test is in the manner in which he divided his herdsmen into two bands to meet the four hundred men who had come with Esau from Mount Seir. The Hebrew word here used for " band " is *mahaneh,* plural *mahanoth.* It is constantly used in the Old Testament in a military and semi-military sense. The Septuagint translates the passage here referred to (Gen. 32:1) with the use of παρεμβολὴ, which is the word for an armed camp. The idea is emphasized in the suggestion that Jacob felt that his " two bands " were equal in fighting prowess to the four hundred mountaineers of Esau; and we shall later see how thoroughly the herdsmen of Jacob were trained in the use of the sword and the bow. These observations find emphasis in the unfolded story of Shechem.

The purpose of Jacob in leaving the house and service of Laban was undoubtedly influenced by religious convictions, as was true in the case of Abraham in leaving Haran; but Jacob's object was also patriotic, which is to say, political. The struggle going on within him at this time was abetted by divine manifestations. At the Jabbok, this struggle reached a stage of coherency. There he changed his destination from the desert steppes of Beersheba to the populous valley terrane of Shechem. Here begins a history which is tangible and significant in itself, and which, as already suggested, offers an exact hypothesis concerning important questions in Pentateuchal interpretation.

The approach of Esau from Mount Seir with apparently hostile intentions drove Jacob to prayer, and brought on the contest with the angel of Peniel. That contest was not only the trying out of a personal cause with Jehovah; it was the onset of history in a violent taking of the kingdom of God. In its issue was brought to settlement the destiny of mankind. Through the divine investiture Jacob that night became a prince; and also that night his imperilled feudal camp became a people, a nation. It was the historic beginning of Israel. The theophany met responsive human conditions. In the diminutive state there helped to birth were homogeneity of blood and cohesion of spirit. These herdsmen were Semitic kinsmen of Jacob, of his wives and his concubines. They were all of the Abrahamic family, descendants of Terah. This fact came to Jacob as an inspiration. In a moment, as it were, the whole future of his programme was re-oriented. The unity of the shrine and the state rose in realization, no longer through the vision light of Bethel, but through the impending actualities of Shechem.

The time had now come to take possession of the land promised to his grandfather Abraham. Upon this promise he would at once begin to realize, not through force, but through a process of peaceful occupation and generation, a programme of temporal mathematic, rather than of militant aggression. The thought was worthy of a world builder; and, although time proved its direct impracticability, its significance and impact were not lost to subsequent history.

Having settled matters with Esau, but closely keeping his own counsel, Jacob turned directly westward from the ford of the Jabbok and pitched in the valley of Succoth, facing one of the main and already ancient crossings of the Jordan. A distance of less than two days' journey westward lay the Amorite city of Shechem, which now became his goal. The recognized importance of Shechem had caused Abraham to make it his first stopping place in Canaan, when coming out of Haran. In the time of both Abraham and Jacob it was the capital of whatever government or influence related the Amorite people of the Westland in a unity of ideal or effort. It was the place which particularly favoured Jacob's scheme of conquest through generation. He would now make it his capital and the seat of Israel's national shrine.

Crossing the Jordan, after possibly two years of rest and recuperation in the valley of Succoth, he suddenly appeared with his caravan on the eastern border of the valley of Shechem. With his well-trained herdsmen soldiery he pitched at a place called Shalem, near the base of Mt. Ebal. This Shalem, by some, is identified with an existing small Arab village which approximates the logical site of its Bible predecessor. From this station, Jacob entered into successful, though, we must say, constrained realty negotiations with the Shechemites. The " parcel of land " which he obtained must have been of considerable extent, including a wide stretch of valley and a formidable reach of mountain scarp.

On a calculation, having regard for the emergence in force heretofore indicated, I undertook, in 1926, a personal survey of the probable boundaries of Jacob's land portion at Shechem. Taking the reputed tomb of Joseph, or even the verified site of Jacob's well, as a landmark, this freehold stretched from near the walls of Shechem for a distance of one and one-half miles along the eastern face of Gerizim, and embraced indeterminate portions of the underlying valley. The present day aspect of this tract, and its relation to the now being uncovered city, strongly suggest an element of constraint in the details of its purchase. For, although Jacob should have adhered to his policy of non-aggression, the militaristic character of his camp and the presumptions suggested by the extent of his flocks and herds were an instant recommendation of his wishes. It is evident that no item of his request was denied.

Securely settled in his tiny principality, the token of coming nationality, Jacob established the shrine in convenient relation to his feudal holdings. The designation of this shrine as *El-Elohe-Israel*, " God, the God of Israel," must be recognized as significant of anticipated nationality. No other altar dedicated by either Abraham or Jacob was given so significant a designation. The altar site at Bethel was called *El-Bethel,* "the God of Bethel;" but the Shechem altar was to celebrate the God of *Israel,* the national Jehovah, later to be revealed to Moses. Within the gates of Shechem, six furlongs away, was the shrine of *El-berith,* the same monotheistic *El* worshipped by the early postdiluvians as the *covenant* God (*berith* meaning "covenant"), almost certainly a monotheistic shrine at the time of Abraham.* Possibly the patriarch sacrificed there at his earliest coming to Shechem, as he did at the altar of *El-elyon,* at the monotheistic shrine of Melchizedek at Salem. However, here, on Jacob's freehold, the world *El* was to be worshipped as the God of Israel. Thus did the Israelitish state and shrine emerge together. Pragmatism can never separate the ritual of the altar from the code of the law. The Pentateuch was written in miniature at Shechem.

It would seem that during the first stage of Jacob's

---

* The student will note that the form *El-berith* does not occur in our English Bible; but in Judges 9:46, from which only Berith is derived by our English translators, the Hebrew reads El-berith. This reading is followed by the Septuagint, which has *βαιθἢλβεριθ,* "the house of El-berith." Jerome (in the Vulgate), Luther and the King James Versionists mistook *El* for a polytheistic term in the verse cited, and so rendered it *deus, gott,* and god. The background of the Shechem uncovering was absent. But the textual aspect of the Hebrew is favourable to my view that the temple site discovered at Shechem was originally that of a monotheistic shrine. In Judges 8:33 it is recorded that "as soon as Gideon was dead, the children of Israel . . . made Baal-berith their god." In Judges 9:4 it is told how Abimelech, the usurper, received seventy pieces of silver out of the house of *Baal-berith* at Shechem; while, when the desperate inhabitants of that same Shechem sought refuge in that temple, they chose to remember it by its ancient and holier title of *El-berith,* "the house of the covenant God."

Shechem residence, a period of not less than ten years, his plans prospered and that he enjoyed to a growing extent the favour of his neighbours. From at first regarding him as an invader, they came to esteem him as a fellow-citizen; and, no doubt, they were much mollified by reason of the extensive barter and exchange which they had with his growing establishment.

At the beginning Jacob's herdsmen would have depended for their water supply upon the abundant springs which break from the slopes of Mt. Gerizim. But the inconvenience of reaching these springs, as also the fact that they were constantly haunted by cattle poachers and robbers, suggested to Jacob the digging of a well in the valley at the front of his freehold. But the digging of this well has a far deeper significance than temporal convenience. It emphasized the thought of Israelitish settlement and stability. Next to a fortress, a well was the most stabilizing institution of antiquity, and this well is without parallel in the history of antiquity; the Shechemites had entered upon no such enterprise. This alone speaks of foresight and statecraft.

The chronology of the period between the departure of Jacob from Padan-aram and his leaving Shechem adjusts itself, within safe limits. I have calculated the stay at Shechem as extending over thirteen years; it could not have been less; it may have been longer. At the time of leaving the house of Laban, the eldest son of Jacob, Reuben, was a lad of twelve years, while Dinah, his sister, was an infant of only one year. At the end of the Shechem stay, the older sons of Jacob were far passed the years of adolescence, being referred to as " men " in the record, and their sister had become a woman of marriageable age. Two to three years were spent at Succoth, while another probably was spent at Shalem in negotiations, which would have brought Dinah to the age of fifteen, and beyond. These figures are interesting, and all the more so since they are calculated on a basis of all but exact chronology.

The unhappy and unexpected circumstance of the deflowering of the young Dinah ended the hope of peaceful Israelitish conquest through generation, and brought on a situation of strife and blood. Like her Grecian sister, Helen of Troy, the young Hebrew princess through her wantonness brought disaster to her people. When the Bible informs us that two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, brothers of Dinah, " took each man his sword and came upon the city boldly and slew all the males," the obvious meaning is that, in their onset of revenge, they employed their feudal retainers, some hundreds in numbers, no doubt; and at that not exhaustive of the entirety of the body of Jacob's armed herdsmen. So far as Simeon and Levi were concerned, the attack was as much of the spirit of conquest as it was of the spirit of inquisition. (See Gen. 49:5-7.)

The immediate result of the reprisal of the sons of Jacob on the prince of Shechem was the possession of his city, its rich tributary valleys and its contiguous mountain-sides. They had made their anger a pretext for translating their father's programme of peaceful acquisition into a programme of violence. However he deprecated the foray and saw in its results the present end of his vision of conquest, Jacob assumed corporate responsibility for the entire transaction and reckoned the conquest to constitute a permanent title. While dying in Egypt and blessing his sons, he made direct and illuminating reference to this militaristic incident. In indicating a special allotment to Joseph he said, " Moreover, I have given to thee one portion (Hebrew, *one shechem,* that is, 'one shoulder' or 'portion of the sacrifice') above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow" (Gen. 48:22). The play in this passage on the word *shechem,* "portion," makes the connection doubly certain.

The record in Genesis is persistently brief; but it is clear that Jacob took possession of the city of Shechem, so far as it was still habitable (which probably was so, except for the palace), and made it the seat of his feudal or patriarchal administration. That he took possession of the Temple of El-berith is certain. It is equally certain that he transferred the field altar, " El-elohe-Israel," to the door of the temple, as I have elsewhere shown.

In addition to the work of uncovering done at Shechem in 1926, Dr. Sellin, of the University of Berlin, the chief promoter of the task, was able to put in several months of the late summer and autumn of 1927 in further pushing the advance through the complex of the three great civilization remains of the *tell,* adding additional and indubitable proofs of the identity and antiquity of the mighty mass which so long has escaped the attention of historians and archæologists. The results continue to bear testimony to the Scriptural claims made for the residence here of both Abraham and Jacob. Among the objects retrieved in 1926 were two cuneiform tablets of the age of the Tell-el-Amarna writings, and barely missing the time of Jacob.

What is of the greatest significance is that the tablets found at Shechem were contractual compacts, and of the character of what, no doubt, was written on a similar tablet given to Jacob in receipt for the purchase money paid for the field bought by him of Hamor, the father of Shechem. That some such tablets, directly relating to Jacob or Abraham, repose somewhere in the vast remaining heaps of Shechem, I can scarcely question. I also look wonderingly forward to the uncovering of the necropolis of Shechem which, without doubt, was used by both Abraham and Jacob in entombing their feudal dead, Abraham having acquired sepulture rights therein, as declared by St. Stephen in his defense before the Jewish Sanhedrin (Acts 7:16).

The persistency with which Jacob clung to the accidental military title acquired by his house to the whole demesne of Shechem is significant. It passed to after generations which held that the acquisition of Shechem constituted a pre-eminent title to the entire territory of the Amorites. In this spirit Moses directed that the ancient covenants with Jehovah (Elohe Israel) should there be renewed and there the law reproclaimed and that it should be considered the head city of the land. This direction Joshua carried out immediately following the conquest.

But although the city and the immediate territory of the Shechemites thus early were brought into the hands of the Jacob family, the Amorite confederacy was too formidable successfully to be withstood. Discovering that the premature and unadvised action of his sons had awakened the wrath of the princes about him, Jacob faced the necessity of decisive action. After purging his establishment of incipient idolatry he removed to the safe retreat of Bethel, a twelve hours' caravan journey to the southward, and thus was postponed for four hundred years the Israelitish conquest of the land.

But the Shechem transition left behind it a history of the highest evidential value. For one thing, it exhibited the *Israel* beginning of the Hebrew people's traditions, a designation which has distinguished them through four thousand years of consecutive time. In the light of this beginning and continuity the theory of a non-wilderness, non-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch becomes centreless. The Mosaic wilderness programme took up the suspended Shechem programme of Jacob in the establishment of a cultic-political theocracy and the promulgation of an according law. The second was the exact echo, or fulfilment, of the first. From the years of Jacob's Shechem residence was left a residuum of fact and association of which no belated Jahvist or Elohist could have been aware, a residuum hidden in the ruins of the old Amorite capital. The scant and ingenuous record of Genesis has had to wait for the unfolding pages of another one of God's books—archæology. The results of the excavations at Shechem have set the personality and movements of Jacob in the clear light of historicity, and have related the details of his migration (shall I say, invasion?) story into a close and logical unity.

The excavations at Shechem have developed the fact that the curb of the well of Jacob, the most thoroughly identified Old Testament landmark in Palestine, is on the geological level of the recently uncovered gate of the tower of Shechem (Judges 9:46), the fundaments of which served each successive occupation down to the time of the Greek emperors. Over the existing pavement stones of this tower passed the feet of Abraham and Jacob. The pottery test fixes the date within safe figures. The curbstone of Jacob's well lies below the surface of three to four meters of temporal accretions, and on the primitive rock surface. That the present curbstone is the original construction, there can be no doubt. It was designed by its builder to outlast the ages, and thereby to become a symbol of the eternity of his conquest. The gate of the tower of Shechem, dating probably from an early secondary stage of the city's history (approximately) 2000–2300 B. C., rests on the same geological surface as does the well-curb. By every token, the latter antedates the first half of the eighteenth century B. C., while the former goes three to four centuries farther back, possibly to 2100 B. C., or earlier.

The very ancient Canaanitish palace uncovered, along with the gate and defense walls, shows signs of having been plundered and simultaneously destroyed. The adjacent pottery indicates a date coincident with the taking and sacking of the city by the sons of Jacob. But the city was almost immediately rebuilt, and that by its former Amorite inhabitants, or such as survived. Between the two stages of building there is no trace of foreign intrusion or influence. This agrees with the Genesis record that Jacob and his sons, almost immediately after the taking of the city, removed to Bethel, and that through fear of reprisal on the part of an Amorite confederacy.

This, so far as its ruins have been made to speak, is the testimony of Shechem to the historicity of Jacob; but the uncovering of Shechem is an unfinished task. About five-sevenths of the *tell* remains to be excavated; and this area includes the ancient necropolis, the most promising and wonder-inspiring heap in Palestine. Dr. Sellin, the heroic German archæologist, has given labourious devotion to the work during parts of the past four years, as also for a time previous to the World War. The honour of having collaborated with him during the 1926 uncovering period remains one of the uplifting and faith-exalting experiences of my life. The reports of Dr. Sellin's work during the autumn of 1927 have been received and translated. They inspire the hope that hitherto unexpected results will be obtained, when sufficient funds can be found for laying bare the secrets of the detrius-covered necropolis piled against the flank of Mt. Gerezim.

I have scarcely dared to think, much less to speak or write, of what is possible to be brought from the sepulchres of Shechem. After a brief season, in 1926, spent with Dr. Fisher, at Megiddo, and witnessing the triumph achieved in uncovering the rock-built tombs of that foil of Armageddon, I have awaited with cumulative emotions the hour of entering into " the sepulchre which Abraham bought of Hamor, the father of Shechem." But, even before this triumph, the extent to which already adduced evidence bears on the Jacob ideals is apparent, and also is worthy a present consideration.

In his defense before the Jewish Sanhedrin, the martyr Stephen said: " So Jacob went down into Egypt and died, he, and our fathers, and were carried over into Sychem (Shechem) and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem." This statement, since the time of Jerome and the early church fathers, has been a source of embarrassment to devout interpreters of Scripture, and in modern times has become the occasion of a bold and flippant criticism of Stephen and Luke. One or the other has been charged with ignorance of Old Testament history and fact. But in the light of evidence presented in this chapter and the résumé of Scripture and archæology bearing on Shechem, the statement of Stephen appears to be not only a citation of literal history, but is also illuminative of a wide reach of the early Hebrew record.

It seems but reasonable to allow to the stay of Abraham at Shechem a period of five to seven years; it could hardly have been short of that. Also the record accounts for an Abrahamic feudal household of more than fifteen hundred souls, and at the time of the Shechem residence the number was plus that of Lot, his family and his herdsmen. The deaths that must needs have occurred in so large an establishment during this space of time would have been numerous and constant. The ancient peoples, and especially the Hebrews, interred their dead either on high hillsides or in rock-built sepulchres. At Shechem, then, Abraham bought a sepulchre in the general necropolis, for which he took the customary receipt in the form of an inscribed cuneiform clay tablet, the like of which we found in the area of the temple of El-berith. Abraham's constant and long use of this burying place settled his claim to it. The cuneiform tablet testifying to its purchase passed from the hand of Abraham to that of Isaac, among other Abrahamic records. When Jacob settled at Shechem he naturally claimed this family sepulture right, possibly sending to his father Isaac, at Beersheba, for the indenture. The necropolis immediately adjoined the demesne of Jacob, as indicated by the site of Jacob's well, which explains the reference in Joshua 24:23.

But the objection is urged that Abraham is represented as purchasing this sepulchre from "Hamor, the father of Shechem;" while Jacob, one hundred and fifty to seventy-five years later, is declared to have acquired "a parcel of a field" in Shechem from "Hamor, Shechem's father." Critics have generally considered the two statements on their face to be contradictory; but they are not; rather they are confirmatory. "Hamor," which means "a he ass," and, hence,

" the chief burden bearer," was evidently the title of the patriarch, or ruler, of Shechem, just as " Pharaoh " was the title of the king of Egypt, while " Shechem " was the common designation of the heir apparent of the ruling house, as the eldest son of the English royal house is known as the Prince of Wales. That there should have been a " Hamor " in the time of Abraham and another in the time of Jacob offers no more difficulty than that there was a " Pharaoh " in the time of Abraham and another in the time of his grandson.* A similar situation is presented in the cases of Abraham and Isaac in connection with Abimelech the King of Gerar and his military minister, Phicol. Some critics have held that these two stories represent a confusion of the text, or else an ignorant repetition of the story as told concerning Abraham. This is a gratuity. Abimelech means " the father king," and so was an inherited title; while *Phicol* signifies " the common mouth," and so became the hereditary title of the prime minister, like vizier, " the common eye."

It seems certain, therefore, from the statement of Stephen, that the bodies of all the eleven brethren of Joseph were embalmed in Egypt, carried over into Shechem, and there interred in the family tomb. After nearly four hundred years the mummy of Joseph was given to the common repose. The research at Shechem has approached to the point of the proof of these conclusions. A day of fuller attestation, with new illuminations of patriarchal history, awaits the parting of the veil of nearly forty centuries of silence.

---

* Five hundred and thirty years later, in the Israelitish era, the Israelitish patriarch, or elder, of Shechem was referred to as " Hamor, the father of Shechem " (Judges 9:28).

In closing this chapter, it seems pertinent to add a few words to the well-supported estimates of the numbers constituting the feudal households of Abraham and Jacob. Evidently the Abrahamic establishment did not suffer in size or importance after it passed to the hands of Isaac, for we hear of a prince, who is rated as a king, saying to him that his state and substance were "much mightier" than his own (Gen. 26:16). When Jacob and his people added themselves to the settlement of his father at Hebron there should have been present in the community an aggregate of eight thousand souls. The account of the removal of Jacob into Egypt shows that his immediate family consisted of seventy persons. It is but logical to suppose that a sufficient number of servants went with his herds to tend and safeguard them in the journey and to keep them after their arrival in Egypt, but it does not appear that such bands attended him thither as followed him out of Padan-aram.

What was the after history of those retainers of the Isaac-Jacob camp left in Palestine? The answer may make one of the most interesting stories connected with the early history of the land of promise. It is strictly an explication of archæology. Bible scholars and archæologists for a long time have been aware of the fact that the Hebrew language was spoken to some extent in Palestine during the four hundred years of the Israelitish bondage in Egypt. The Tell-el-Amarna tablets show that writing in Hebrew was not unknown there during this period. Also these tablets contain references to a mysterious and militant people in the land, described as *Habiri*. This name, found only on the monuments, is generally accepted as being a form for Hebrew. So nearly have the Habiri and the Hebrews been identified that some critics have concluded that the tablet references to the former point to the invasion by Joshua. Finding chronological difficulties here, others have sought to show that there were two Hebrew invasions of Palestine, the first in the age preceding that of Joshua. But no such theory-spinning is necessary to explain the fact involved. Amenophis IV., who reigned in Egypt sometime during the century and a half preceding the time of Moses, had inherited from his predecessors extensive territories in Palestine and other parts of the West Land. These territories particularly included the fortress city of Jerusalem and the lands afterwards included in the inheritance of the tribe of Judah. At this time, Ebed-Hepa was governor of Jerusalem. Several of the Tell-el-Amarna letters are from his hand to Pharaoh Amenophis, telling of the depredations of the Habiri on the king's holdings of Gezer, Gath, Keilah, Bethshemesh, Lacish, and other cities in the circle of the left-over Syrians of Jacob at Beersheba. The Jabbok-Shechem vision and ideals of Jacob remained strong in the consciousness of these near Israelites, and they were attempting to assert a hereditary ownership of the land.

But another and even more suggestive sequence comes to this view of the left-over camp of Jacob in the hinterland of Beersheba. It now seems possible that the Kenites, a people which played an interesting and romantic part in the conquest of the lands allotted to the tribe of Judah, may have been identified with the Habiri, and also with the community left behind by Jacob. Efforts have been made to classify the Kenites as a tribal contingent of either the Midianites or the Amalekites, but their affinity with Israel is much more apparent and will quite fit into the conclusion that, during the four hundred years of Israel's bondage, the several thousand ex-retainers of Jacob multiplied into a strong and warlike people, and not only retained the Beersheba hinterland and its northward contiguities, but also pushed southward into Kadesh and the interior of the Sinaitic Peninsula. During this period the descendants of Lot became the kingdom of Edom, while those of Esau likewise multiplied into a nation.

Jethro, the priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, whose offspring was incorporated in the tribe of Judah (Judges 1:16), was a Kenite; and it is conceivable that the monotheistic shrine at which he ministered in Midian was the survival of the altar of *El-elohe-Israel,* erected by Jacob at Shechem. It is also conceivable that this Jethro was in possession of the Abrahamic traditions, as contained in the early chapters of Genesis. It now seems that we should place the shrine of Jethro at Kadesh, in the northern circle of Midian, rather than so far southward as is usually indicated.

Dr. Sellin is authority for the suggestion, that in pre-Mosaic times a sanctuary existed at Kadesh and that there are indications that Levites were priests of the same (Aftermath Series, p. 248). Very ancient calendarial records also are believed to have existed there. These, together with the fact of a local monotheistic worship, were, no doubt, the magnet that drew Moses to that august retreat. It is my confident expectation that these conclusions will be immensely strengthened by the final uncovering of Shechem.

VI

THE AGE OF THE LAW

THE age of the law properly includes the life and activities of Moses and Joshua; the first, as having written and promulgated the commandments and the cultic statutes of Israel; the second, as having applied the same in the newly established confederacy in Canaan. The histories of the lawgiver and the conqueror are inseparably related to the history of the law.

It is of distinct value to Scriptural proof to note how the life of Moses was prepared for the extraordinary leadership and legislative work into which his fortunes brought him. Introduced, providentially, from his infancy, into semi-regal relations; educated in such wise, and under such conditions, as brought him to a mastery of world literature, and especially to a mastery, as it would appear, of the legal code of Hammurapi and its ancient common law sources; being endowed with a high racial affection, profoundly meditative, and ruled of a passionate human sympathy, he was predestined to the enterprise whose success constitutes the beginning and the proof of the divine revelation, as contained in the Written Word.

In the circle of ancient Memphis, at the head of the Island of Rhodus in the Nile, the Egyptian guide shows the tourist the place of the launching by the mother of Moses of the ark of bulrushes which held the infant prophet. Imagination may well accede to the truth of this claim; but there is no material token of identification, either in fact or in the featural aspects of the place, save that, crowning the only appearance of rock formation in this section of the Nile delta, there is an ancient-looking Moslem building of pretentious proportions, which certainly has had many predecessors; while a path leads from its gate to the brink of the river, where water flags lift their fronds, as in quiet confidence of an ancient secret. Thus nearly does a material proof come to light. The incomparable drama of the water babe well may have been staged at this nearly unchanging spot.

However, at Heliopolis, the seat of the university of Pharonic Egypt, and where Moses was taught in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, the case is different. Beside the now lonely monolith of On, once a member of a group of three to five, there are evidences of a most ancient occupancy, and that in an apartness which still impresses the visitor and suggests the cloister and an atmosphere of great learning. The terrane at this point is considerably elevated, and is always above the high tide of the Nile. This alone is a strong point in the identification of the college shrine of the priests of the sun god. No spot in the high water level of lower Egypt has suffered so little change and effacement as this. So far as I have been informed, no excavations have been undertaken within this circle; but I indulge little doubt that the pick and shovel some day will uncover here the foundations of a temple with cultural adjacencies, and who knows but that with it may be found a nest of cuneiform tablets like those retrieved at Tell-el-Amarna, that will instantly and surprisingly illuminate the life history of Moses.

A natural sequence brings us to a probable connection of Moses with these Tell-el-Amarna writings, discovered in 1881. Amongst them was a tablet carrying the text of the Babylonian myth of Adapa. This tablet, in the old classic Assyrian, was marked with red indices, showing that it had been used as a textbook in an Egyptian school, just as Cæsar and Hesiod are used in the schools of today. This tablet was left buried at El-Amarna a century or more before the age of Moses; but that, in his student days in the priests' school at On, amongst the towering monoliths, the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter was supplied with similar writings, is beyond a reasonable doubt. How pitiable, then, the old-time higher critical hypothesis that writing was unknown in the age of Moses. It was perhaps at this point that the backbone of Wellhausen higher criticism was broken. Moses and the Tell-el-Amarna tablets were too great a load to be carried by the pragmatic hypothesis.

Fleeing from the wrath of Pharaoh, Moses, as we are informed in the book of Exodus, went into the land of Midian; that is, to Kadesh of the Midianites, if we properly read the record. Besides being a means of self-preservation, this was a purposeful exile on the part of the future lawgiver of Israel, with a highly religious motive. In a former chapter I have referred to the Habiri, which I have identified with the Abraham-Isaac-Jacob feudal community of not fewer than eight thousand Syrian descendants of Heberite stock left by Jacob in the hinterland of Beersheba, when he went with his immediate family into Egypt.

Scholars and critics generally have identified the word Habiri with that of Heber, or Hebrew. These Habiri had the Abrahamic faith, and considered themselves co-heirs with his descendants to the soil of Canaan, hence their future aggressive activities in trying to possess the land, especially that which later became the inheritance of the tribe of Judah. The Tell-el-Amarna tablets tell of these contests during half the time of the bondage of the Abrahamic tribes in Egypt. During this time the Habiri, on their own motion, represented the Hebrew claim to the land; as also they preserved the Hebrew history and tradition. In addition to the *toledoths,* or tables of patriarchal genealogy, they possessed the ritual of the beginning theocracy established by Jacob in the conquered temple of El-berith at Shechem, together with other Heberite and Abrahamic writings. During the four hundred years of Israelitish bondage and oppression in Egypt, the Abrahamic memories and traditions suffered great diminution in the minds of the enslaved tribes; indeed, it is safe to conclude that they well nigh disappeared. But during these four hundred years the Habiri in Palestine multiplied, pushed northward through nearly the whole of Judea, and southward through half the extent of the Sinaitic Peninsula. At Kadesh, a monotheistic shrine was established, with a ritual after the order of that of Jacob at Shechem. This shrine, at the time of Moses' self-expatriation from Egypt, was under the priesthood of Jethro, to whom Moses joined himself, married his daughter and became his archdeacon. Dr. Sellin, of Berlin, is authority for the statement that evidences have been found of an extensive collection of calendarial records, once laid up at Kadesh; and also that there are evidences of a Levitical priesthood having been exercised here in the second millennium B. C. (See Aftermath Series, "Archæology versus Wellhausenism.") This is direct and conclusive evidence of the joint priesthood of Moses and Jethro in Midian, at the time at which he was visited by the theophany of the burning bush. For, let it be understood, that the flocks which Moses kept in Horeb, were not commercial fatlings, but sacred sheep devoted to the altars of Kadesh. Archæological remains at Kadesh are of a genuine and testifying character. Chiefly because of a temporary indisposition, I was denied, in 1926, a visit to this site, when some of my colleagues went thither from Shechem. My information concerning the site is first hand.

With this collateral evidence in hand, there emerges a fact which I have been led strongly to affirm, and in which I have been seconded by strong continental authority, namely, that it was during the second forty years of his life, and while serving in the joint priesthood at Kadesh, that Moses wrote the book of Genesis. The purpose which carried him to Kadesh was fulfilled in finding there a kindred of blood and a survival of the Abrahamic monotheism; but much more in access to those calendarial records already referred to; and which, no doubt, were a cuneiform heritage derived through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and left in the Syrian or Habiri community at Beersheba by the latter on his sudden departure into Egypt. From these records, as from his other ample stores of patriarchal and world knowledge, Moses, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, brought forth the first book of the Hebrew canon. These conclusions, I am persuaded, will withstand the test of all future criticism.

In former chapters, I have discussed the archæology of the store cities of Raamses and Pithom, in Egypt, the constrained Israelitish labour upon which was the immediate cause of the Exodus under Moses. The foundations of these cities have been so completely uncovered and identified that the merest tyro in Bible science must see their significance. The presence in one place, and the absence in another, of straw in the bricks of the walls testify minutely to the story of their erection, as told in the book of Exodus. The identification of these sites has helped to fix the point of Israelitish departure out of Egypt, and also the place of crossing the Red Sea. As history, these matters are now as well adjusted and testified to as are the details of the march of General Allenby from Kantara to Jerusalem.

The attempts archæologically to locate the line of journey accomplished by the Israelites through the wilderness of Sinai have not been wholly successful; but several points have been accounted for, so that the general narrative has been established firmly. What is of more than passing significance is that Moses planned to lead the people into the land of Canaan by the open gateway of Kadesh, the scene of his forty years of ministry and history writing. Previous to twenty-five years ago this, as a point of criticism, would have been of negligible value; but since the association of the Habiri with the shrine of Kadesh, the meaning is clear. Moses would leave a base of kindred blood and of cultural sympathy behind him to guard the gate of his entrance into the land of promise.

After the debacle brought on by the report of the false spies, and the necessity for a circumbendibus to the Jordan, the men of Judah had to fight their way from that stream back to their Habiri, or Kenite, confederates of the South Shephalah. Future interpretation and Bible criticism will build largely about this Habiri concept.

The extent and character of the tabernacle and its belongings, as created by Moses in the wilderness, have been the pivot of pragmatic criticism against the claims of the Pentateuch. The gold used in fabricating this tabernacle and its furniture represented a value of ten millions of dollars; and it was boldly asserted that this amount of gold was not within the possible command of Moses; and, if so, neither he nor any of his compatriots knew how to work it. The opening, seven years ago, of the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen, a Pharaoh, who lived a century before Moses, revealed an exhibit of fifteen millions of gold and jewels, wrought in the most delicate and cunning fashion. This, together with the now well established hypothesis that the two millions of Israelites who went out of Egypt carried with them twice, or treble, that amount (see Exodus 12:37), has put an end to this one-time confident argument.

The history of Joshua and the Israelitish conquests makes direct contact with at least two of the major points of interest and developed proof in the field of Bible archæology, namely, Jericho and Shechem. More or less important relationship is sustained to at least four others, Taanach, Megiddo, Lacish and Gezer. Perhaps also Bethshemesh should be added to this list, as we shall have occasion to show. Interesting and instructive light is reflected from the Tell-el-Amarna letters and other collateral records. Very recently archæological attention has been turned to the field of Ai and Bethel, where the second stage of the conquest of Joshua began. Interest in Bethel relates not only to the period of the conquest, but equally to the time when Bethel became a buffer between the Northern and the Southern Kingdoms of Israel. The time may come when, to an effort directed to the sites of these twin cities of the Ephraim highlands, will be returned results as satisfactory as those obtained at Jericho.

The identification of the site of the Jericho of the conquest is complete and beyond question. With the exception of a small section of the eastern wall, which has disappeared, the entire circle of the city was established by Dr. Sellin in his excavation work. This ancient city is astonishingly small. In fact, it was little more than a citadel, with intramural dwellings for a few thousands of people, quite compactly settled. Its foundations were constructed of rudely quarried limestones of irregular shape and size. The superficial walls, both of the houses and the defense barriers, were of mud bricks or lime agglomerate. The frailty of these walls well can be imagined. A breath of miracle toppled them into heaps of rubbish, and all was over.

This fall of Jericho rather has more the suggestion of an earthquake, or other nature violence, than of artificial force. From a survey of the ruins, the impression was made upon my mind that the walls had fallen inward. It is almost certain that on all sides they had been made oblique by their builders, as was the case at Shechem. This was for the advantage of archery and catapult defence. One who studies the site must feel that the situation quite comports with the details of the story of the city's destruction, as told in the book of Joshua. The Bible states that, after the pillage, Joshua burned the city with fire. This statement is fully testified to by the charred lime agglomerate and the fire-blackened stones of the foundation. No historical fact of Scripture perhaps better is corroborated in archæology than is the overthrow of Jericho.

At this point emerges a matter of Israelitish record which has been a butt of pragmatic criticism. After the fall of Jericho, Joshua denounced a curse against any one who should ever attempt to rebuild the doomed city. But in First Kings 16:34 we are told that Hiel, the provincial governor, built his city there, and, as has been presumed, upon the site and lines of Jericho. The facts, however, are now made clear. Dr. Sellin located the wall foundation of Hiel's capital well without the circle of the Jericho of Joshua; and the uncovering showed that the foundations of the same were never disturbed. The palace of Hiel, as Dr. Sellin has identified it, was well beyond the eastern wall. Thus is the Bible record of Jericho clarified and established.

In the earlier and middle stages of the conquest, Joshua subdued or received the submission of the cities of Lacish, Gezer, Bethshemesh, Taanach and Megiddo. These have all been put to test by archæology, and all bear a more or less satisfying witness to the integrity of the record contained in the book of Joshua. The fact that they should be found in such complete physical and historical relationship to the story is matter of prime importance in itself. It shows that the book of Joshua was written in a time when the sites of these cities were well identified, and when the parts which they played in the conquest were well known to the writer. This could not have been the case had the book of Joshua been written eight hundred years later, as the critics once confidently claimed. At the time which the critics allow as the date of the book of Joshua, namely, six hundred years B. C., several of these cities were so nearly non-existent as to be mere villages, or remnants of their former glory. They would not have inspired confidence in a delayed authorship of eight hundred years. In the tenth chapter of Joshua we read: "And the Lord delivered Lacish into the hand of Israel, which took it on the second day, and smote it with the edge of the sword." In 1890, the excavation of this site was begun under the direction of Flinders Petrie, the eminent Egyptologist. His work, though it extended over a period of only six weeks, established the fact that the mound Tell-el-Hesy, was identical with the site of Lacish, and that it represented a city whose history went back to a time much anterior to the conquest. In 1892, the work of excavation was resumed, under the direction of Dr. Frederick J. Bliss. The remains of eight different cities were found in the strata. From the fourth to the sixth of these strata were uncovered confirming evidence that the Israelites had freely mingled with the Canaanite natives, as was foretold by both Moses and Joshua. With these natives the Israelites intermarried and also adopted many of their superstitions.

At Gezer, Macalister found further strong support of the statement in Judges 1:29 that the Canaanites and the Israelites dwelt together. In the layers covering the period from the fourteenth to the eleventh century B. C., are evidences of an agglomerate population, Canaanites and Israelites, and, later, of Philistines, and Egyptians. The corroboration of the Joshua story is steady and complete. If the Bible record of the degeneracy of the immigrant Israelites at this time were destroyed, it could be easily made real from the archæological testimony of these cities of the Shephelah.

No account is given in the book of Joshua of the capture of Bethshemesh, though it is included in the cities allotted to the tribe of Judah. Being on an open terrane, it is more than probable that it was taken in early and direct assault. Excavations carried on there, as reported by Mackenzie, show that the city was burnt in the same manner and in the same age as Jericho. It can hardly be doubted that similar burnings will be found when other cities taken in the conquest shall have yielded their secrets to the pick and spade.

Taanach and Megiddo, though listed in the record of the conquest, have yielded no results that can be connected directly with Joshua, except the general one that the work done at Taanach, by Dr. Sellin, and at Megiddo, by Dr. Schumacher, establish a great antiquity in the case of each, that of Megiddo going back two thousand five hundred years B. C., making it, next to Shechem, probably the oldest city in Palestine, and thus supplying additional evidence of the correctness of the narrative.

Now it remains only to connect the record of Joshua with the archæological exhibits of Shechem. It is significant that Joshua regarded Shechem as the logical capital of the Israelitish tribal confederacy. It was so intended by Jacob and his sons. To Shechem, Joshua drew the tribes for a re-enactment of the wilderness law of Moses. This law was antiphonated from the sides of Gerezim and Ebal. One today easily marks the spot where this must have taken place. It is a mute witness to a long ago transaction. When the foundations of the most ancient Shechem were uncovered, it became apparent that it was known to the patriarchs and to Joshua, just as the excavators beheld it. The fundaments of the temple of El-berith, described in the book of Judges, remained as they were in the times of the conquest. It was this temple which, after the taking of Shechem, was appropriated by Joshua and was described by him as the " sanctuary," and before the door of which he set up the memorial stone described in Joshua 24:26. When, in 1926–28, the foundations of the temple of El-berith were fully exposed, a mighty block of limestone with a plinth was brought to light. It spoke instantly, and with a voice of awful antiquity. It yet may be too early to pass the final word; but there is scarcely doubt that it is Joshua's memorial stone, which has lain for nearly two thousand four hundred years, wrapped in its mantle of rubbish and clay. The proof of God's word marches on.

After this summary of archæological data bearing on the Mosaic law, it will be in place to consider that matter which has become the crux of the historical and compositional criticism of the Pentateuch, namely, the dating of the book of Deuteronomy. With unfriendly criticism, all other issues have been subordinated to the theory of the non-Mosaic and post-dated character of the Fifth Pentateuchal book.

From about the third decade before the World War to a comparatively recent time, the Pentateuchal problem centred in the heart of a contention concerning the origin of the book of Deuteronomy. With a well attested backward drift of criticism toward traditional and near-traditional viewpoints, there has come a corresponding lessening of insistence upon radical conclusions drawn from Deuteronomic aspects and relations. But without a study of the record of the entire controversy neither the Deuteronomic nor the general Pentateuchal question, as approached from the viewpoint of criticism, can be brought to an end either of settlement or understanding. The fifth book of Moses remains the battleground for conservative thought and the weakening ranks of pragmatism.

If one can make sure of any definite deduction from the mass of conflicting critical opinions and assessments of " assured results," the age-long Deuteronomic contention is to be stated thus: Deuteronomy is the earliest written of all the law codes of the Old Testament; but, so far as concerns the main body of legislation contained therein, it was put together in the reign of Josiah, specifically, about the year 621 B. C. This so-called Josiah code is known to critics of the later Wellhausen and related schools as Ur-Deuteronomy, and was fabricated out of hand by Hilkiah the high priest, or perhaps by a group of which he was head. Through intention, or as a logical sequence, it became the basis of the religious reformation promoted by Josiah, of which account is given us in Second Kings 22 ff. Together with the Leviticus and Holiness codes, written out only in exilic and post-exilic times, Deuteronomy, during the age of Ezra, was inclosed, as within an envelope, in the historical or narrative parts of the Pentateuch, as read by us today. This enveloping process was carried on and completed by priestly redactors, or editors, in the period already indicated, namely, about the middle of the fifth century B. C. These priestly editors not only combined the several literary " sources " about the codes, but themselves supplied prefaces, historical approaches, *nexi* and glosses to an extent which made their contributions the preponderating and coherent element in the literature.

It is further to be noted that the Josiah code received sundry additions during the century, and more, before it was inclosed in the aforesaid common narrative envelope; also that this inclosing envelope is not genuine historical matter, but is made up, as before indicated, from anachronistic "sources," chiefly the Jahvistic (J), and the Elohistic (E). There are also other and minor "sources," variously catalogued and designated. These " sources " generally are, or were, held to have been created by the prewriting prophets of the ninth and eighth centuries B. C. They are sometimes further distinguished as the Judaic and Ephraimitic, or Southern and Northern, "sources." Finally, the priestly writing, or *Grundschrift*, became the medium through which all the employed " sources " and codes were made to flow in *pseudo* historical consistency.

This in brief outline is the Deuteronomic hypothesis as formerly, and, to a great extent, at present, held by a radical school, perhaps properly known as higher critics. The answer of the conservative or traditional group to this hypothesis is a general denial, on the basis of a consistent claim for the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch; a claim which, let it be said, has received tremendous endorsement since the World War in Germany, the land which gave birth to radical criticism. Indeed, the situation in Germany has so changed that the radical school represents the minority contention, as against a steadily increasing reaction toward the general position of traditional orthodoxy. Professor Max Löhr, in his recent and quite remarkable work, a manifest of his abandonment of the Wellhausen hypothesis, *Das Deuteronomium (Untersuchhungen zum Hexateuch Problem II)*, says: " Deuteronomic inquiry heretofore has been conducted largely from the viewpoint of a so-named ground writing, or Ur-Deuteronomy, contained, as within a shell, in our present possessed Deuteronomy of the Jewish canon." Again, in a brochure, *The Five Books of Moses,* which in 1924 I was able to induce Professor Löhr to write for the "Aftermath Series," the author says:

" Deuteronomy is, as is known, the Archimedean point from which the higher critique believes it can shake the Pentateuch world to its foundation. And for many years it has been characterized as the most certain result of the Old Testament science that the book of the law from Second Kings 22 is identical with the kernel of our book of Deuteronomy. This certainly is today in no wise undisputed, and indeed, one may say, the Deuteronomy problem has been in full flow again for many years. . . . This kernel must be taken for what it is and will continue to be—*a very ancient book of Mosaic origin.*"

But lately, as formerly, there have been expressed other and varying opinions, which may be noted. Steuernagle and Bertholet identify Ur-Deuteronomy with the Josiah book (*Buch der Lehre*). Kittle concludes that the Josiah book, as presented to the king from Hilkiah, was not an original antedating creation, but a composition out of hand. Hempel assigns its original to the early temple rule and conceives its use to be connected with the cause of cultural centralization at Jerusalem. Hölscher seems to hold that no general clue to an Ur-Deuteronomy is found in the canonical book. Other critics refer the setting up of the canonical book, which includes the Ur-Deuteronomy, to exilic or post-exilic times. Wellhausen did not allow that Deuteronomy, or even Ur-Deuteronomy, was written at the time of Josiah; but, if I retain correctly the summary, made years ago, of his conclusions on this point, he would assign it to the age of Hezekiah, or to the early reign of his son Manasseh. At least, this would be more in keeping with the Wellhausen contention that the inception of the narrative "sources" should be referred to ninth-century prophetic activity. But, however the pragmatists have differed as to details, they have been agreed that there was an Ur-Deuteronomy, that it was fabricated in later or middle prophetic times, and that it was fraudulently credited to Moses.

Thus is the case stated from the side of the radical contention of thirty years ago, and later; which, as already indicated, generally has been yielded or modified in Germany, the land of old offending, but is still sought to be maintained in not a few would-be radical schools and pulpits, especially in America, where the critical attitude, confessedly, is belated.

In our present study the inquiry and argument will proceed along three lines, namely: First, as to the evidence, or lack of evidence, for an Ur-Deuteronomy in Second Kings 22 ff. Second, as to the cultic, historical and political situation in the kingdom of Judah during the reigns from Hezekiah to that of Ammon; and, third, as to the reciprocal internal and comparative evidence furnished by Deuteronomy and the other books of Moses.

Is there found in any statement in the passages cited (2 Kings 22 ff.), or in corresponding passages in Chronicles, a warrant for the theory of an Ur-Deuteronomy, or any other volume or writing, other than "a very ancient book of Mosaic origin"? This, and not a hybrid theory of "source" writing, is the crux of the argument. It is fact against fancy and foible. Since the serious application by Vatke, Graf and Wellhausen of the Astruc thesis to the historical criticism of the Pentateuch, the critics have professed to find warrant for their theory of a manufactured Deuteronomic original in the programme of Josiah for a cultic centralization in the temple at Jerusalem; for the quartering there of the Levitical orders and for the stated and national observance of the Passover. These are alleged to be contradictions of or addenda to the ancient Israelitish order; if, indeed, not the creation of an entirely new and reactionary order in the theocracy, and hence requiring a new and out-of-hand legislation, which is represented in the Ur-Deuteronomy of Hilkiah.

To establish this supposititious situation in Israelitish history, it was necessary to invoke the aid of the other " source " theories, especially that of the Priestly, or P. Through this agency was supposed to be killed off the historical dependableness of the records of cultic concentration under David and Solomon, Levitical community residence under various kings and the reported observance in earlier reigns of the Passover, along with other temple feasts. It is an axiom that the complex of a critical theory must hold together or altogether fall with the subtraction or discounting of a single one of its complexities; which reminds one here of the recent affirmation of Max Löhr that the claim of a P " source " in Pentateuchal composition is without foundation in fact or evidence. With other writers of contemporary note, the great Königsberg scholar is now in Germany scouting as mythical the theory of a Judaic and Ephraimitic origin of the materials so punctiliously allotted to the Jahvistic and Elohistic pseudo history makers. The theory too much resembles an apothecary's prescription to satisfy the large-mindedness of the self-shriven former "*Anhanger*" of the Wellhausen school. Also, the Astruc " divine appellative " clue has shrunk to a scant consistency under the X-ray comparisons of the Massoretic, the Seventy and the Samaritan texts. Indeed, the whole " source " theory is now seen as a stilted interloper in the house of Old Testament interpretation. Hebrew history and legislation, of which Deuteronomy is a part, are consistent, natural and vital throughout. Conservative thought sees a way through the problems of this history and legislation, which problems have been sighted, but not compassed, by the elaborate system long known under the name of higher criticism.

The critics have seen the reformation of Josiah not as a spiritual restoration, a renaissance of national religious consciousness, but as the sighting of new objectives, and that through clandestine vision, and on a basis of novel experimentation. This tends to attach a greater creative and constructive importance to the effete and expiring kingdom of Judah only a century before the exile than to the whole body of Israel in the wilderness theophany, when heaven and earth met to witness the giving of the law. True to the whole concept of the higher critical hypothesis, it reverses the order of Israelitish life and history. The implication of the critical theory of an Ur-Deuteronomy, forged in the time of Josiah, is abhorrent not only to a reverent notion concerning the Israelitish theocracy, but to the human sense of order and necessity in history. To the Davidic, Solomonic and near ages of Israelitish life, among the most brilliant and spiritually conscious in the annals of the race, it denies not only the comprehensive sense, but also the very form, of a legislation which alone can account for their spiritual and political militancy. Equally, it seeks to account for a civilization of law and worship, as having been worked out in rabbinical cloisters, when the record declares that it blazed its beginning in the face of heaven through forty years, from the escarpment of Sinai to the Arabah of the Jordan.

Even the uncritical reader will see how the theory of an Ur-Deuteronomy must single out certain sections of the law code and priest statutes found in the canonical Deuteronomy, as also narrative sections of the same, dealing with the wilderness observance of the Passover, and identify them with a counterfeit code, conceived and written under impossible conditions near the end of the Jewish monarchy. As a method it is thoroughly arbitrary. Moreover, the critics show that they do not understand, or have misjudged, the spirit and motives of the men about Josiah at the beginning of his reformation. Marti, as quoted by Löhr, says: "I have found a difference between the mind of those reporting the finding of the Josiah book and the mind of the high priest, of whom it is well established that by a method of overreaching he passed the newly found law book to the chancellor, and he to the king, as a purchase of good wine, but throughout making no mention of the secret of the book's creation." A high authority has characterized this treatment of the story as suspicious; and truly it is so. Where in the whole passage is found a reason for asserting the existence of such difference? There is no such difference; and here, as everywhere else, it is the thing assumed by criticism that makes a problem in Old Testament interpretation. Left alone, the Bible story is self-evident. But that is just what the critics have not done. For instance, Hölscher observes that in the story of the finding of the law book we have to do with a mystification of the priests, and adds: " This Josiah book, naturally, is not to be accepted as an actually old and accidentally discovered volume." Such observations are of no critical value, negative or positive. This particular venture tends toward the stock conclusion of the radical school that, whatever its contents and range, the Josiah book was a " pious fraud." Hölscher himself has compared it to religious law impostures perpetrated in Rome in the name of Numa, in 181 B. C. The answer is that the analogy disappears in the fact that the Numa deception was discovered, and had no perceptible effect on world or Roman history, while the Josiah book has passed as valid history for more than twenty-five hundred years, and has had built upon it the glory and triumph of the Messianism of the Christian ages.

Adopting the conclusion of Löhr that the passage in Kings yields no evidence of the creation of an out-of-hand code of laws, meant to meet the reformation programme of King Josiah, but holding steadfastly to the view that his programme came spontaneously out of the book with its Mosaic content and challenge, we shall take up the testimony of Hilkiah in passing the book to the hands of Shaphan, the king's chancellor.

The record reads thus: "And Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. And Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan." The parallel reading in Chronicles adds that the book of the law was " by the hand of Moses."

Several things must be considered in connection with this record. First, the temple was being repaired and refurbished after more than half a century of profanation and disuse (read 2 Kings 21, covering the reigns of Manasseh and Amon). What more probable than that during all that time the temple copy of the law should have been misplaced and left concealed under accumulating rubbish in cloister, nook or closet? Second, an air of perfect sincerity is manifested by the high priest, which is equally true of Shaphan the chancellor. It is "the book of the law" which has been found. The language is utterly ingenuous and the movement of the actors without squint of diplomacy. Had there been a conspiracy to deceive the king, Shaphan, no doubt, would have been in it; but the manner of the transaction quite excludes the thought. Third, the book is given into the hand of "the scribe," the proper legal custodian of it. There is no suggestion on the part of Hilkiah that the scroll is to go to the king. The scribe himself was to pass upon the significance of the writing and determine the use to be made of it. Almost certainly it was in archaic characters, and even the high priest could little more than determine its tenor. A complete interpretation was for the official scribe. Fourth, the situation reverts logically to the closing scene in the Deuteronomic drama in the Arabah of the Jordan, eight hundred years before:

"And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord, your God, *that it may be there for a witness against you.*"

What a fulfilment in the discovery of the book of Hilkiah!

Notwithstanding the suspicion cast upon this and other statements credited to "the hand of Moses" by the hypothesis of an anachronistic priestly writing, I dare assert the Hilkiah book to have been a genuine historic writing of the Mosaic age; none other, in fact, than the one placed by the order of the lawgiver in the side of the ark eight hundred years before. The preservation of a vellum roll for that length of time in the dry climate of Palestine does not approach the domain of the marvellous. The extant codex of the Samaritan Pentateuch at Nablus is a lively example.

In vain one searches the record as it touches each and all those who were in the king's confidence for the slightest sign of indirection or self-consciousness. The group was of personalities from the court. Beside Hilkiah and Shaphan, were Ahikam, the latter's son, Achbor and Asahiah, a councillor. These were charged by the king with a mission concerning the discovered book to Huldah the prophetess. The committee delivered its message in a straightforward way. It is plain that the high priest was in no way suspected of duplicity; and that, if guilty, he played the part of impostor to unparalleled success. But the illuminating and convincing contact is made in the response of the prophetess (verse 16): "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, *even all the words of the book which the* *king of Judah hath read.*" She instantly recognized the book as the one prepared " by the hand of Moses " and committed to the side of the ark, and all but literally quotes the words of the lawgiver, as recorded in Deuteronomy 31:29. This agreement could not have come through the purposefulness of a redactor or a literary counterfeiter. The compositional situation is conclusive of integrity at both ends of the history. Also, a world of scholastic criticism goes down before the reproachful words: " *that it may be there for a witness against you.*" The oracle of the wife of Shallum was as though it said: " This scroll of the law has been preserved to the end of a witness and warning that shall count in the kingdom of Messiah." And why not? The reformation or restoration of Josiah was the beginning of a spiritual Judaism which made humanly possible the coming of the Messianic Lawgiver. The consistency of the story is cumulative throughout; and consistency is the surest basis of criticism.

The cultic, historical and political situation in Judah from the reign of Hezekiah to that of Josiah must have a vital bearing on the Deuteronomic problem, in so far as the critical claim for a fabricated Ur-Deuteronomy is concerned. Some critics would place the composition of the Josiah book late in the reign of Hezekiah or some time during the long reign of his son Manasseh. The difficulties in the way of this supposition are insuperable. First, the whole reign of Hezekiah was dominated by the spirit of the prophecy of Isaiah, and that dominance became more pronounced during the last years of the king's life. There is nothing in the record of Hezekiah's rule, nor in the Isaianic prophecy, to suggest the fitness or possibility of such a compositional venture as that charged against Hilkiah. From the beginning of the reign of Manasseh to the tenth year of Josiah the history of Judah describes an appalling spiritual decline, relieved only by Manasseh's brief humiliation following his hostage imprisonment in Babylon. During the greater part of this period the temple worship at Jerusalem was as pagan as that of the heathen shrines of neighbouring nations. In fact, it was in the midst of this orgy of pagan idolatry that the temple scroll of the law was lost, as also forgotten except by the aged and more devout of the people, like Huldah, the prophetess wife of the keeper of the sacred vestments. The cultic soil was too barren for the springing of even a religious imposture.

It was the consistent contention of the old critical school that the two main objectives of the Hilkiah Deuteronomic imposture were the concentration of the Levitical orders in Jerusalem, so as to create a powerful hierarchy, with the high priest at its head, and the establishment of the Passover as the ranking national feast, neither of which before had been an order in the theocracy. The record is a direct contradiction of this contention. The reign of Hezekiah accounted for a general concentration of the priestly orders (see 2 Chron. 31:2 ff.), and also witnessed the celebration of the Passover in such fashion as had not been " since the time of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel " (2 Chron. 30:21). Of course, I am not unmindful of the critical gesture toward a priestly " source " writer who has ordered the record as he would. But, in heaven's name (I address the remnant of the Wellhausen pragmatists), is there to be permitted no historical justice, no recognition of a logical fact! The criticism complained of has been, and is, as crass and dishonest as it is misguided and self-obsessed. No wonder Professor Robert Dick Wilson, a master of Semitic languages, some years ago impatiently asked: "Is the higher criticism scholarly?" This authority, in rejection of the whole radical hypothesis, has pointed out that the different sections of the Pentateuch, as to their distinguishing verbal groups and stylistic peculiarities, were influenced by the times and surroundings in which they were written, or from which their matter was derived. Thus the early chapters of Genesis are marked by a strong infusion of Babylonian terms, showing that the matter used by Moses in their composition came through a direct tradition of the Abrahamic family. Nor is it by any means too much to suppose that both Abraham and Jacob brought with them from the shores of the Tigris and the Euphrates cuneiform tablet writings, which survived to the Mosaic period. Cuneiform writing, retrieved within three years, by Doctor Sellin from the ruined fundaments of the temple of El-berith at Shechem, all but reaches the date of Jacob's sojourn there, and is a prophecy of what may yet be brought from that necropolis, where, undoubtedly, repose the mummies of Joseph and his eleven brethren.

The latter chapters of Genesis, on the other hand, are marked by a persistence of Egyptian words, which is natural and logical, since they were written from the viewpoint of Egyptian culture and ideals. After studying the Midian (or Kadesh) experience of Moses in the light of evidence reflected from the Shechem excavations, I have become convinced that the book of Genesis was composed by him during the second forty years of his life, and during his service at the shrine of Jethro the Midianite priest. There he would have had access to additional postdiluvian Semitic records, as the *toledoths* and antediluvian patriarchal memorabilia. Dr. Sellin is of opinion that there were laid up at Kadesh, the shrine of Jethro, very ancient calendarial writings which probably came through the stream of the Abrahamic migration from the earliest Semitic times. This involves the to me now certain inference that the tribe of which Jethro was head was a southward extension of the Habiri, a people made known to us through the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, and none other, as I hold, than the offspring of the Syrian, or Heberite, feudal community of Abraham and Isaac, left by Jacob in the hinterland of Beersheba, on the occasion of the migration of himself and family into Egypt.

The " polychrome Bible " of forty years ago, in dealing with Deuteronomy, along with the other books of the Pentateuch, sought to delimit the " Ur " section of that volume in a maze of priestly and redactorial addenda; but the discrediting of that attempt marked the collapse of radical criticism as a science. Like the dream colossus of Nebuchadnezzar, it came in a night and stood for a day. In that day, the intellectuals worshipped it and multiplied essays in its favour; but thousands have lived to see its fall, and to discover that, though its midriff and thighs were of brass, it had been fitted only with feet of clay. Modern scholarship, while far from having found a rest for the soles of its feet, will not sponsor this patchwork of guesses; so it lives on as a monument of learned folly, a tragedy-comedy worthy to be entitled, " Much Ado About Nothing."

But, it will be asked, " What answer do you give to the ' source ' theory of the origin of the Pentateuch; and, specifically, what answer to the ' Ur ' hypothesis of Deuteronomy? " The answer so far as regards the general Pentateuchal involvement is that the hypothesis has been so modified both by itself and later criticism that little remains to its adherents except the naked *belief* concerning a discredited Bible. As a certain advocate of the school has said, " There *is* a ' source ' hypothesis, and that is all that can be affirmed." So the idealist says: " There are only ideas —no matter;" but the alleged proof was long ago given to discard. As to the Deuteronomic hypothesis, the answer is a flat denial on the basis of the ascertained fact that no evidence for an out-of-hand Hilkiah writing is found in the passages in Kings.

A situation which quite discredits the critical interpretation of the Hilkiah story is seen in the reign of Jehoshaphat, a king of Judah of like spirit with Josiah. This situation is described in Second Chron. 17 f., where we read: "Also in the third year of his reign he (Jehoshaphat) sent his princes . . . to teach in the cities of Judah. And with them he sent Levites . . . and with them priests. And they taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them." This event occurred quite two centuries before the reformation of Josiah; but the account of it is derived from the same so-named Jahvistic " source " as that which furnishes the story of the codex of Hilkiah. The Hebrew designation, *sepher hattorah* (book of the law), is the same in each instance. Thus it appears that " the book of the law," prepared " by the hand of Moses " as a manual of instruction for priest and people, was not at this time lost, as at the beginning of the reign of Josiah. Noteworthy also is the record in the selfsame Jahvistic discourse (to use the term) as found in Joshua 1:8: " This book of the law (*sepher hattorah*) shall not depart out of thy mouth." From Jehoshaphat back to Joshua is scant five centuries of time, a practical half-way point between the two. Why was not the reformation of Jehoshaphat fixed upon as a time for the forging of an Ur-Deuteronomy? There is as great certitude in the one as the other. Also, let it be noted, the Jehoshaphat reformation fell before the earliest date allowed to the Judaic writing. Truly, the contradictions of the old pragmatism were wonderful to contemplate!

In the confidence of these well-grounded objections to a post-dated Deuteronomy, we proceed to a consideration of our last point, the testimony to Deuteronomic integrity in the internal and comparative evidence furnished by canonical Deuteronomy and the other four books of Moses.

During the decade which has followed the close of the World War it has become a deepening conviction among conservative scholars that the settlement of all Pentateuchal questions is to be found in a proper historical and compositional orientation of the book of Deuteronomy; that is, the establishment of the true relationship of Deuteronomy to the other four books of Moses. So far as my knowledge goes, no scholar in Christendom has given so much industrious and concentrated study to this matter as has Wilhelm Möller, a minister of the Evangelical Church in Germany. In 1925 I secured permission of this former Wellhausenite to translate and publish in this country an abridgement of his *Rückbeziehungen des 5 Buches Mosis auf die vier ersten Bücher, ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in den Pentateuch im sinne einer Einheit und Echtheit.*

In an introduction to this work, Pastor Möller says:

"In Deuteronomy we have a fixed point from which it may be shown that the Pentateuch is a *unit* and that it is *Mosaic* in all its basic characteristics. As to the former, the retrorelations of Deuteronomy to the historical and legal data in the other four books (the Tetrateuch) are so numerous, so systematic, and so comprehensive that all that precedes Deuteronomy appears as one complete network, which was extant prior to Deuteronomy and now is most intimately connected with it. Furthermore, this position is in thorough harmony with the chronological order of the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy; hence the removal of single threads from the fabric of the Tetrateuch is an act of violence that destroys the artistic pattern and is the more objectionable, since these retrorelations include portions that have been considered priestly literature (P) and post-Deuteronomic. In another respect, Deuteronomy is the fulcrum that makes it possible to move the customary (critical) view. If it can be shown that the whole historical and legal content of the Tetrateuch was known to, presupposed and used by D, then the Tetrateuch must move back in point of time as soon as the authenticity of D is established—that is to say, if D is of Mosaic origin, then Genesis-Numbers cannot be post-Mosaic either in content or composition. Hence with the authenticity of D we establish the authenticity of the entire Pentateuch."

This work of Möller is destined, as I believe, to become epoch-making and to set the new conservative school in the way of putting the whole critical study of the Scriptures back upon a basis of reverence and soundness. In his treatment of Deuteronomy, Möller shows how completely the historical and legal details of that book are interlaced with the other four books of Moses and how completely the author of Deuteronomy knew these other four. In several hundred comparisons of the text of Deuteronomy with that of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers he shows that Deuteronomy is nothing else " than an explanation of the written *Tora,* or law, as that *Tora* has been passed through the other four books, and is not the bringing in of a new law," as the critics have contended. Nor in all these citations has there been found a single contradiction in the several records, when brought together. Such a result would be morally impossible had the author of Deuteronomy and of all or even one of the other four books been an imitator or counterfeiter.

The method which Möller has so learnedly and effectively employed in comparing Deuteronomy with the books of the Tetrateuch may be used to a satisfactory extent by the least technical student. The first five verses of Deuteronomy are held to be an introduction to the book, reciting in the briefest way the itinerary of the tribes from the place at which they were left by the book of Numbers. The chapters and verses which follow deal with the law as already enacted and as set forth in the preceding Pentateuchal writings. A good concordance or a cross-reference Bible properly and studiously used will show at least the ground of this method, and will spring a well of satisfaction. I give a few examples.

Deuteronomy 1:6-8 recites the command of Jehovah thirty-eight years before in Horeb (Sinai) to the children of Israel at once to possess themselves of which they had long had promise. Compare these verses with Numbers 11:20-36. In Deuteronomy 1:7 the eastern border of Israel is given as the Euphrates. With this agrees Genesis 15:18, as also Exodus 23:31. Deuteronomy 1:8 recalls the promise of Abraham and his sons. See Genesis 12:7; 13:15; 15:18 ff. Deuteronomy 1:13 f. recites the history of the appointment of judges in Israel. Compare Exodus 18:21-26. These two passages agree as to the division of the people into groups of "thousands," "hundreds," "fifties," and "tens." Would an imitator have exercised such prescience of detail in either a backward or a forward look? Deuteronomy 1:22-26 restates the story of the spies sent to view the land of promise. Read Numbers 13:1-33. There is agreement as to the number of spies sent out, as also to the details of their search. Could two authors, each a conscious counterfeiter, a hundred years apart and a thousand years from the events they claimed to describe, have arrived at such close statement and detail? To imagine it is to imagine a miracle greater than all claims of tradition.

But let these citations suffice. Pastor Möller has collated hundreds on hundreds of these cases of agreement, so that " all the historical material of the book is used in the alignment." Nor is there a less agreement of the legal code of Deuteronomy with those of the Tetrateuch. Nearly all the ordinances of the books of the covenant are found in Deuteronomy, and there is everywhere abundantly exhibited such similarity of form and idiom as to make impossible any other theory than that of unity of authorship. The integrity of Deuteronomy is established in the integrity and unity of the whole Pentateuch. Conservative scholarship has reverently accepted the task of establishing this claim of the Mosaic canon.

VII

THE NATIONAL AGE OF ISRAEL

IN the purview of this study, the national age of Israel will extend from the close of the conquest under Joshua to the end of the Jewish monarchy under Zedekiah. Next to the Christian age itself, this is the most religiously eventful age in the history of mankind. During its centuries, the moral law promulgated under Moses became established in the consciousness of the chosen people; the most magnificent temple ever reared was finished at Jerusalem; the order of Hebrew prophets arose and practically fulfilled its mission, leaving an incomparable literature as its contribution to the moral and spiritual thought of the pre-Christian ages. Meanwhile, the great empires of the East, Babylon and Nineveh, rose to the height of their power, and culminated, Nineveh, in the seventh century, B. C., and Babylon from one to two hundred years later. But, greatest of all, while these events were in process of happening, the Kingdom of Messiah was being forecast, and became the supreme objective of prophecy.

During the latter half of this age, the Israelites, both of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms, were brought into militant contact with Egypt and Assyria, and also with such lesser powers as Damascus, Philistia, and the tribal principalities along the Arabian border. In fact, the militancy of Egypt and the East became formidable only during this later period. To this fact Israel owed the opportunity of its early and formative existence. While these great powers were integrating strength, the prophecy of Israel reached the fulness of its ideal.

The archæological remains which bear most direct testimony to the historical truth of the Scriptures belong to this age. So far as these remains have been identified, they begin with the period of the Judges; but throughout that period the points of contact are really few in number. However, the suggested relationships are many and interesting.

The Bible student should be advised that wherever archæology and other collateral evidences have touched the Scriptures, the integrity of their dating has been established. In many cases, this integrity, as a matter of human apprehension, could not have been established except through contemporary proofs; nor could the integrity of compositional statements be believable except upon the basis of contemporary authorship. Thus it must appear conclusive that those sections of Kings and Chronicles which deal with the wars and final overthrow of the Kingdom of Northern Israel were written by eye-witnesses, or near eye-witnesses, of the same, and not by scribes in exilic, or in post-exilic times, as unfriendly criticism would have it appear. That the chroniclers several centuries later should have put these events in detailed correspondence with the record of the monuments, is a proposition too difficult for ordinary understanding, especially when the critics deny to these chroniclers the gift of inspiration.

The wars of Northern Israel were altogether, or nearly altogether, with the kings of Assyria; and that empire perished, and its remains were buried, nearly two hundred years before the Jewish exile began. Also the Northern tribes, coetaneously with the fall of Samaria, were carried into unreturning captivity; so that what of their history then was not written and left with their kindred of the South, could never have been written. That it was so written is made evident by its correspondence with the reading of the tablets, which after two thousand six hundred years were brought to light in the uncovering of Nineveh, as we shall presently begin to show. An exhibit uniform with this case of Northern Israel and Assyria extends throughout the Old Testament books.

The fact is cumulative of sound argument that only where the monuments and other affirmative sources have failed to yield Bible support has criticism found its characteristic innings. This, at times, gives a negative advantage to the objectors; but criticism is essentially a negative proposition. So was Deism in its day; so is Unitarianism; and so in modern theological subjectivism, which is a negation of everything essential to the divinity of the Gospel. Judgment looms against the negationists, earlier and later.

Men have seldom paused to think that doubt must rest on the same character of proof as faith. That philosophy, as that theology, which does not consider this is false to itself no less than to the truth with which it seeks to deal. If one has not a grounded cause against what is authoritatively put forth as fundamental fact, to reject it is to stultify reason. This clearly is the attitude of those critical schools that, in the absence of profane corroboration, reject vital statements of the Old Testament. How many times, by reason of a few syllables yielded from an ancient monument, these attitudes have been forestalled; and how many times, through the same agency, the "assured results" of criticism have been resolved into air, is a history that can never be written down in detail. It is, however, one that moves steadily to its logical end.

With this approach to the general subject, we may now apply the principle of archæological test to the events of Israelitish history during the judicial and regal periods.

The national life of Israel appears less distinct during the age of the Judges than during any previous or later time. With the exception of the accounts of decisive battles, either of victory or defeat, what we learn about the people is what falls out in connection with the personal career and affairs of the several Judges, except it be for the story of Micah, the Danites, the Levite of Mount Ephraim and the tribal warfare between the Benjamites and the rest of Israel, which close the book of Judges. But for all this, no little is exhibited in the way of integrating the revelation and of establishing the record as made.

The second chapter of Judges opens, after the account of the death of Joshua, with a list of the nations which the war of conquest had failed to dislodge from the promised inheritance of the tribes, and which were left to "prove Israel." This list, in turn, is followed by the statement that the Israelites dwelt amongst these native remnants, intermarried with them, and were seduced by their gods.

In a former chapter, I have indicated how the results of excavations at Gezer and Lacish corroborate these early statements, in showing Israelitish and Canaanitish houses set close together in the ruins. Also the testimony of uncovered cultic objects is direct as to the progressive idolatry of the insinuated Israelitish elements. A history of Israel's defection at this time might be written from these ruins.

Othneil, nephew of Caleb, was the first of the Judges. He was called into action by the invasion of one Cushan-Rishathaim, who oppressed Israel for eight years, and who is supposed to have been a king of Mitanni. His name has not been found on the monuments; but Professor Sayce has connected it with a Mitannian attack on Egypt, of which there is a cuneiform record at this time. Palestine, lying directly in the way from Mitanni to Egypt, naturally would have been held by the invader as a key to the Egyptian enterprise. While the case positively has not been made out, it shows conditions which render the narrative doubly probable.

The drama (Judges 3:12 ff.) in which Ehud, the successor of Othniel, and Eglon, the king of Moab, appear, is one of the most realistic passages in the historical books of the Bible. Dr. Kyle, in his volume on the exploration of the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah, relates that he and his party found time to tarry by the way in Moab and test out the seat of Eglon in the land accursed in prophecy. However, only general results were obtained, but gave assurance that direct and confirmatory relationship yet may be established. It was from this general terrane that the Moabite stone was obtained, about which we shall speak when we come to the period of the Israelitish kings to whose reigns it refers.

The next passage in the history of the Judges is the one which embraces the stirring and ever memorable war lyric of Deborah, "a mother in Israel." Of the native kings left unconquered in the land, the most powerful was Jabin, king of those Canaanites whose habitat was in the approaches to Lebanon and the lower Galilean hills. Sisera, a war lord of Jabin, dwelt in "Harosheth of the Gentiles," just within the circle of the Valley of Esdraelon. At his command were nine hundred chariots of iron and a numerous troop of foot soldiers. For twenty years, in the name of his overlord, Sisera oppressed Israel. Moreover, his stronghold severed Israel into two unequal parts, thus threatening the extinction of both. The only masculine heart in any bosom in Israel at this crisis was that in the bosom of Deborah, the prophetess, who judged Israel after the death of Ehud and Shamgar. This incomparable woman stirred the courage and resolution of Barak, who marshalled ten thousand rustic patriots from the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali and met Sisera and his host near the banks of the Kishon, under the hills of Galilee. The result of the onset is notable in the annals of human warfare.

It would appear that the Kishon had been flooded as the result of a cloudburst the previous night in Mount Gilboa, and that its low-lying banks, forming little more than a trough in the land, were filled to their height with raging waters. The fundous soil was also treacherously soft from rain. The drivers of chariots, in attempting to infold or outflank the mountain soldiers of Barak, found their chariot wheels sinking in the yielding earth. This put them at the mercy of the arrows and long-shafted spears of their enemies; while Sisera's foot soldiery was cut off by its impeded vanguard. The chariot drivers, in their effort to extricate themselves, fell into the scarcely perceived waters of the Kishon and were drowned. The foot soldiery was then pursued toward Harosheth and put to the sword without the escape of one.

Fifteen to twenty kilometers to the northwest of the battlefield, a huge heap of ruins frowns in the narrow pass between the Kishon and the Galilean hills. The Arabs call this heap *Harathiyeh*. The common judgment of scholars now is that it is "Harosheth of the Gentiles," described in the story of Barak's victory. Nearly midway between Harosheth and the battlefield is the *tell* of Sharid from which, in 1926, I recovered pottery of the tenth century B. C. It is my belief that this *tell* might be made to reveal some testimony of the days of the captaincy of Sisera. But should this, or even Harosheth, when distrained of the spade, yield no definite word, the battlefield beside the Kishon is a bill of charges against the madness and folly of the Canaanites in making their attack. Standing before the front of the Kishon, one sees how the whole catastrophe befell. The captain of a tyrant king, despising the handful of rustic spearmen who dared oppose him, threw his heavy troops and chariots into a plain which had become a quagmire. That this host had been predoomed of Jehovah to destruction, as the writer of Judges tells, easily can be believed.

Following the exploits of Barak came the Judgeship of Gideon, whose militance and faith have acquired a singular and universal renown. His divine appointment to leadership, and the manifestations attending his acceptance of commission, fittingly prelude the onset of lamps and pitchers which he led against the host of the Midianites. Of that, the perhaps most unique battle recorded in any history, there remains, as in the case of Barak's victory, no material trace or token; but, again, as in the case of Barak, the scene of the battle and the features of its immediate contiguities, so completely fit into the details of the story as to carry the stamp of verity.

With thirty-two thousand Israelitish patriots, Gideon descended into the Valley of Esdraelon at ancient Engannim, the modern Jenin, and turning northeastward, made a brief march into a sheltered cup or cove of Mount Gilboa, just east of Jezreel. The front of this cove, looking northward across the Valley of Jezreel, was covered by the well, or rivulet, of Harod, whose banks in that day doubtless were fringed with a fenny growth which made a covert for the illdisciplined Israelitish force. Immediately across the slender Valley of Jezreel begin the slopes of Little Hermon, against which the formidable Arabian army was deployed, awaiting attack, or the opportunity to give battle on its own account.

To one who visits this now well attested situation, the conviction becomes instant that a true and detailed account has been given by the Jahvist writer. The conviction also becomes strong that the story was written down at or near the time of the events described. It is clear, as we have noticed already, that Gideon realized the raw and undisciplined quality of his fighting force. For this reason, he slipped into the covered position behind the waters of Harod. This also gave him the opportunity to observe, while himself unobserved, the movements of the foe. Twenty-two thousand of his Israelitish volunteers, through want of warlike spirit, returned; while the remaining ten thousand were tested in a way that adds yet further proof to the record.

The whole body of the ten thousand was drawn up to the Harod and ordered to drink. Three hundred only showed thoughtfulness and soldierly strategy, by holding their weapons in one hand and lifting water to their mouths with the other, meanwhile watching the fenny covert against surprise from the enemy. The other nine thousand seven hundred dropped their weapons and bowed down upon their knees to drink. This revealed their mettle and divided them from their fellows.

An open landscape, over nearly level ground, enabled the three hundred to make an after-midnight dash upon the sleeping camp of the invader. Though, assuredly, helped of divine providence, the victory was the result of superb tactics and dauntless courage. With tremendous force all this came over me, as I marked the contour of Gideon's hiding place, and swept the space between the declivity of Gilboa and the camp site of the Arabians at the foot of Little Hermon. It is impossible that the story could be fictitious.

After the death of Gideon, Abimelech, his degenerate son, aspired to be king, and when he had slain all his brethren except Jotham, the youngest, he repaired to Shechem, where he was proclaimed king by the Shechemites. The subsequent story of Abimelech involves several points of archæological interest and contact at Shechem that shed effective light on the Bible narrative. From " the house of Baal-berith " (El-berith) the kinsmen of Abimelech took for him seventy pieces of silver with which to further his designs. I have repeatedly shown that this temple of Berith was originally built as a monotheistic shrine, and was such in the days of Abraham and Jacob, and was by Joshua pre-empted for the worship of Jehovah; but a later history shows it to have been degraded to idol worship. Baal took the place of El.

In the uncovering of this temple, in 1926, Dr. Sellin discovered the pedestal of a *gottesbild*, evidently an insert, as it were, into a long, though often disturbed, monotheistic record. Also, within the precincts of the temple an image of Baal of the approximate age of Judges was recovered, corroborating the supplanting of Jehovah worship, following the age of Joshua, as also the prevalence of Baalimism at nearby Ophra, the birthplace of Gideon.

The scene of the crowning of Abimelech is significant of a collusive fact which is worthy of attention. "And all the men of Shechem . . . went and made Abimelech king by the plain of the pillar that was in Shechem." The Hebrew of this passage reads: " by the *oak* of the pillar that was in Shechem." I have shown that Jacob's altar, " El-elohe-Israel," was erected before the door of this temple, as was also the memorial stone of Joshua, they almost certainly having been accounted for in the uncovering of Shechem. From the time of the patriarchs to that of the Judges a notable oak shaded the entrance to this shrine. It was under this oak that Jacob buried the teraphim and earrings of his people (Gen. 35:4). It was under this oak that Joshua set up his memorial stone (Josh. 24:26). It is expressly affirmed that the oak was by the sanctuary of the Lord—the rededicated temple of El-berith. This discovery of Dr. Sellin showed an immense limestone block, with a fallen pillar that once surmounted it. These were the oak and pillar of Abimelech (Judges 9:6).

The remaining passages of Judges, including accounts of the heroic activities of Jephtha and Samson, furnish us no climaxing evidential materials. Geographical details may be traced with much certainty; but no relic of antiquity is left by the way. Only the stories themselves speak with convincing verity of the facts of life and action in which they are grounded.

The reigns of David and Solomon make no certain contacts with the monuments, so far as read. However, about the Holy City there are many reminders of their days. Certain rock scarps worked into the walls of Jerusalem go back to the times of the Jebusites, and so include the period of David. Also, there can be little doubt that the section of wall today known as "the Wailing Place of the Jews" is a survival from the foundations of the temple of Solomon. Very many other tokens testify to the truth of the story of David's conquest of the Jebusite stronghold, which he made into a fortification and left to Solomon, who made it into a splendid capital. The memory of the conqueror and the builder can never depart from Mount Zion.

Gezer, which was the dowry of Pharaoh's daughter, when she became Solomon's wife, has an important archæological bearing on the Bible record of Solomon. The towers of the defense walls of that city, uncovered by Bliss, are referred to Solomon's work of fortification, told of in First Kings 9:16, 17. Taanach and Megiddo also carry a general testimony to the periods of both David and Solomon; and, no doubt, when the ruins of the South Shephelah and Philistia are explored more fully, further footprints of David will be brought to light.

In his excavations at Megiddo, Dr. Schumacher discovered in the foundations of the palace, a seal which carried the inscription: "Belonging to Shema, the servant of Jeroboam." The value of the seal is equal, if associated with the name of either Jeroboam I. or Jeroboam II., as the Scriptures give us to understand that Megiddo was constantly in the hands of the kings of Northern Israel.

In the reign of Rehoboam, king of Judah, Shishak, king of Egypt, made a military incursion into the two Israelitish kingdoms, pillaged the temple at Jerusalem of a large part of its treasure, and also captured and sacked a number of less important cities. The author of the books of the Kings mentions only the invasion of Judah. His silence as to more northern territory is believed to be due to his greater interest in Judah, and also perhaps to the fact that the waste visited upon the north was of lesser extent. A direct certification of this invasion is found in an inscription on a pylon which Shishak erected before the temple of Karnak in Egypt. This inscription carries the names of those cities in Palestine which Shishak had subdued. Amongst these are such clearly recognizable names as Gath, Taanach, Shunem, Bethshean, Gibeon, Bethhoron, Aijalon, Megiddo, Magdala, and the field of Abraham (Hebron?). Of this partial list, five are located in Judah, and are enough fully to establish the integrity of the record found in the books of the Kings.

In this general age, Ashurnasirpal, the first of the Assyrian kings to approach the territory of the Israelites, penetrated to the mountains of Lebanon and the coasts of the Mediterranean. From Lebanon he carried wood of cedar, cypress and juniper to Nineveh to be used in building temples and palaces. This strongly bears on the patronage of these mountains by Solomon in building the temple at Jerusalem.

A most noteworthy Assyrian monument is the black obelisk of Shalmaneser, the successor of Ashurnasirpal. This monument claims, on the part of the Assyrian, the subjugation of Jehu, king of Northern Israel, and the compelling of tribute from his hands. No account of this tribute transaction is given in the Israelitish books; but the involvement of Jehu and his reign is beyond question. The fact that the monument should designate him as the son of Omri, whose son he was not, strengthens the claim for the tribute. Omri was the king builder of Samaria, and the father of Ahab, whose house Jehu destroyed and supplanted. The Assyrian genitive means only that Jehu was the successor of Omri; otherwise the statement is but a natural inference, where the exact relationship was not known. "The land of Omri" was a name for Northern Israel throughout the East.

The Moabite Stone describes a high point in the triumphs of Bible archæology. Mesha, the king of Moab, who was contemporary with Ahab, celebrates on this stone a victory of his reign. "I am Mesha Chemosh-melek, king of Moab, the Dibonite," he begins to say. He then proceeds to tell how Jehoram, the grandson of Omri, oppressed Moab, and built a city within its borders, and dwelt there at times. Also he tells how he fought against this city and utterly destroyed the Israelites in it. This is supplemental to the account found in Second Kings 3:4 ff. Aside from its historic value, as a corroborative of Scripture, the Moabite Stone throws a light upon the non-cuneiform Semitic script used in the West Land in the ninth century B. C. The inscription also mentions the names of a number of places known to Scripture history, as Arnon, Aroer, Baal-meon, Dibon, Kirathaim, and Nebo.

In the period that follows, an incident of much interest falls out, though it is noticed in no passage of Scripture. Adadnirari IV. of Assyria, who reigned at the end of the ninth century B. C., has left an inscription in which the following occurs: "Adadnirari, the great king, the mighty king, the king of the world, the king of Assyria, who conquered from the Euphrates, the Hittite country, the whole Amorite land: Tyre, Sidon, *the land of Omri,* Edom, Palatsu, to the coast of the great sea, where the sunsets, casting themselves at my feet." As we have seen, the land of Omri was Northern Israel. Palatsu was Philistia. This corroborates a general Bible attested activity of Assyria at this period.

Tiglath-pileser IV. is mentioned in Second Kings 15:19 (where he is called Pul) as having established suzerainty over Menahem, king of Northern Israel; and again (verse 29) as having captured and carried away to Assyria, during the reign of Pekah, son of Menahem, all the people of Naphtali. Yet again, in Second Kings 16:7, he appears as the overlord and protector of Ahaz, king of Judah. He was the first of the Assyrian kings to make an effective impression on the Hebrew people. In his palace at Nineveh he set up wall tablets detailing his exploits in the West Land; but, unfortunately, a later king, Esarhaddon, erased much of this writing, and, no doubt, meant to destroy it completely; but he died before he could carry out his purpose. The parts of the inscription that remain support the Scripture cited above. From the deciphered fragments is read the following: "The tribute of kings . . . Azariah, the Yaudean . . . Menahem, the Samaritan." "Azariah, the Yaudean," would seem to be "Uzziah, of Judah;" but most scholars consider this Azariah to be a king of Northern Syria; but "Menahem, the Samaritan," is Menahem of Samaria (2 Kings 15:17).

The life of the Northern Kingdom now was drawing rapidly to a close. Tiglath-pileser was succeeded by the warlike Shalmaneser, who "found conspiracy in Hoshea," the tributary king of Samaria. Shalmaneser laid siege to his capital, Samaria. At the end of three years it was taken and more than twenty-seven thousand of its inhabitants were carried into captivity and settled in various subject provinces of the Assyrian empire. Also strangers were brought from these lands and colonized in Samaria. These coalescing with such of the people as were left, and adopting their religion, became the progenitors of the Samaritans of an after time. All this is told in Second Kings 17:3-6 and 24 ff., and is confirmed in the record of an Assyrian tablet of the eighth century B. C., as follows: "Samaria I besieged. I captured twenty-seven thousand two hundred and ninety people from its midst. I carried captive . . . Peoples from lands which my hands had conquered, I carried in the midst. My officers, as governors, I appointed over them. Tribute and taxes I imposed upon them."

The last siege of Samaria was begun by Shalmaneser, as recited in the inscription quoted above, which is that of Sargon and not of Shalmaneser. A year before the siege was completed, Shalmaneser died, and Sargon, his successor, completed it. In his inscription, Sargon claims full credit for the enterprise, and fails to mention the name of his predecessor. If the student will turn to Second Kings 16:6, he will see that it is not Shalmaneser, but "the king of Assyria," who takes Samaria in its final fall. Is it a purposeful entry by the writer of the books of the Kings? It would seem so. Thus finely accurate is the story.

The events prophesied in the short twentieth chapter of Isaiah are accounted for in another inscription of Sargon. Until the discovery, in 1845, of the palace and inscriptions of Sargon, at Nineveh, this passage in Isaiah was the only extant literature in which the name of that monarch was preserved. The value of this fact cannot be discounted.

The next great Assyrian name appearing in Scripture is that of Sennacherib, at the beginning of the seventh century B. C. In Second Kings 18:13–19:37 and Isaiah 36, 37, is the account of his having besieged and captured many of the fenced cities of Judah, imposing tribute upon King Hezekiah; and, later investing Jerusalem with a great army. An inscription of Sennacherib covers these events almost to literal detail as follows: "As to Hezekiah, the Judean, who had not submitted to my yoke, forty-six of his strongholds I besieged, I captured . . . Himself I shut up like a caged bird in Jerusalem. . . . I added a tax as the impost of my overlordship."

The destruction of Sennacherib's army, described in Isaiah 37:36, is confirmed by a passage from the histories of Herodotus, who explains that a multitude of mice destroyed the bow-strings of the soldiers of the Assyrian army, which was then also threatening Egypt. The army thus destroyed was not the considerable detachment at Jerusalem, but the main force at Lachish, which lay nearer the border of Egypt. Modern interpreters believe that mice, which are bearers of the Bubonic plague, a disease working fatality in a few hours, infected the camp of Sennacherib, with the result detailed in the Scriptures.

The crowning work of Hezekiah was the construction of the conduit from Gihon to the pool of Siloam, mentioned in Second Kings 20:20, a statement fully supported by the Siloam inscription, discovered in 1880. Also both Isaiah and the second book of Kings name Esarhaddon as the successor of Hezekiah's great enemy, Sennacherib. This is confirmed by an inscription of Esarhaddon himself.

With the reign of Ashurbanipal, the kingdom of Assyria came to an end, and Babylon again rose in power. Nebuchadnezzar represents this power in Scripture, and was the author of the downfall of the Jewish monarchy, the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of the Jewish people; but no inscription hitherto found covers these events. However, in Daniel 4:30, 31 the reference to the gloating pride of Nebuchadnezzar, as he viewed the greatness of Babylon, is fully reflected in the uncovered remains of the massive walls, palaces and temples of that ruin.

The extent and glory of Nineveh were scarcely less, if, indeed, they did not eclipse, those of Babylon. Strabo reports that it was four hundred and eighty stadia in circuit; and that is exactly the measurement of Babylon given us by Herodotus, which exceeds that of other historiographers. The prophets Nahum and Zephaniah, whose " burdens " relate to Nineveh, give us some understanding of the wealth and barbaric opulence of this capital. Support of their reports is supplied in the results of the excavations prosecuted there by Botta, Layard, Rassam and Ross, who, in turn, brought to light from the ruins of " the bloody city " amazing evidences of an ancient life of luxury and art. Xenophon, who in the year 400 B. C. was camped with the Ten Thousand Greeks near these ruins, when they were much more in evidence than now, was struck with their immensity and significance. Though he did not know the name of Nineveh, he has left us an impression of its greatness which fully agrees with the accounts already cited. It was from the ruins of the library of Nineveh that George Smith, the heroic invalid, retrieved the tablets of the Gilgamish Epos and other priceless cuneiform books.

The distinguishing fact of the national age of Israel was the emergence of the order of prophets, those " holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." These prescient utterances account for a consciousness which had been cumulative from the older dispensations, and which was the realm preeminent of the activities of the Holy Ghost. He not only inspired the messages of prophecy, but He chose and prepared the prophetic messenger. Both the gift and the exercise of prophecy were under His control.

As a continuous phenomenon, the prophetic revelation was unparalleled. It had been foreglimpsed, as it were, in the theophanies granted to Abraham and Moses. But with the eighth century prophets the charisma became full. The forefront of the kingdom was coming into view; that which had been announced from the beginning was taking definite outline.

Short of the apostolic fellowship, no men ever were taken so intimately into the divine counsel as were the Hebrew prophets. Their gifts included foreknowledge of objectives to which their messages related, with exaltation of intellect and emotion ranging to " the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." To this was added, as the Spirit made occasion, power to work miracles in demonstration of the authority of their office. In the delivery of their " burdens," the prophets adopted the formula: " Thus saith the Lord." With the true prophet was never hesitancy, vacillation, nor compromise of utterance. The belief in inspiration was never stronger than with the prophets themselves. Their message was their faith, their lives. " The prophet is a fool; the spiritual man is mad," cried Hosea, when he contemplated the steadfastness of God's seers in the midst of the world's unspeakable wickedness. In like manner, Saint Paul responded from the gospel age, saying: " I am become a fool for Christ's sake." Not seldom it was demanded of the prophets to prophesy " smooth words;" but only " the whole counsel of God " was forthcoming from their lips. Heaven was present when they spoke.

The fact of prophetic sincerity, and the absoluteness of the prophetic message, must impress all readers of the Old Testament, except such as are influenced by super-critical motives, which, as we have seen, spring as often from scholastic obsession as from those deeper convictions which should always rule the critical mind. The materials of Hebrew prophecy are of such nature as require for their understanding and proper placing a deep and reverent emotional reinforcement of intellect. The cold and passionless technique which is native to the atmosphere of scientific inquiry is an interloper in the office of Bible interpretation. The seen must not prevent the unseen, nor must the temporal thrust aside the eternal.

The world will never see again, for the conditions which produced it cannot be repeated, a body of literature like that of the Old Testament prophecies, a literature deposed in the candor of blood, and in the fire of the Spirit. What is self-emphasized in prophecy is the fact that the writing prophets seldom appeared as contemporaries. As a rule, the years that fell between them were of such length as had destroyed the unity of a less divine institution. They stood apart against a background of pronounced individuality. Under such conditions prophet could not have colluded with prophet; collaboration was impossible. Rarely, one was the disciple of another; but each sprang from his own habitat, and burned with the distinction and glory of his own spirit-given message.

So far as the writing prophets were concerned, the term “ school of the prophets ” had no proper application. In the times preceding the writing prophets, there were schools, as in Elisha’s day; and even in those of the later *charisma;* but all the evidence goes to show that the great prophets, as represented in the canon, were set in solitary places, and shone, like the morning star, unattended by kindred lights. In this fact perishes the conceit of pragmatism which alleges the existence of a school of prophetic writers of the ninth to the eighth century B. C., who forged the materials known as the Jahvistic and the Elohistic "sources," from which comes so large a part of the Old Testament writings. It seems an excess of zeal to smite a carcass already approaching the carrion stage; but this gratuitous critical libel of the prophets still obstructs the way to better thought, and must be heaved aside. With respect to this prophetic "source" theory of Old Testament origins, the situation in America is one of arrested enlightenment. Most of our would-be critics, in school and pulpit, are reading and building on the hypothesis literature of thirty years ago. But the authors of that literature, in Germany and, to a large extent, in the British Isles, quite a while ago, began to abandon the Wellhausen hypothesis, and are leaving it a mendicant in the world of thought. Our brethren of the American pulpit "left" appear not to have heard the news. They are threshing over old straw. A book on this phase of criticism, if more than ninety days old, is behind the times.

So certainly is conservatism gaining the mastery of Bible thought; and in nothing more certainly than in this cause of the prophets, as against their hypothesis accusers. The men who, in Old Testament times, lived in the anticipated fires of Pentecost, and who spent themselves in contemplating the coming rule of

Messiah, are doubly dishonoured in having their names associated with a body of spurious decretals, such as the "source" documents are alleged to have been. The bedraggled pragmatic scholarship of today appears to possess neither imagination nor critical acumen.

The part of prophecy in creating materials which enter into the written Scriptures is uniform throughout; and is likewise logical and consistent. The true spirit of prophecy attended the making of the patriarchal covenants; a still more intensified and coherent prophecy paralleled the giving of the law; but the "burdens" of the charismatic age were such an advance upon the earlier vision as to make it unthinkable that the fabrics of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the rest of their fellowship, were woven in the same looms as those of the Pentateuch and Joshua. Yet this is what the "prophetic source" theory implies. Indeed, this theory compressed the whole body of Israelitish literature into little more than two centuries of time, leaving six hundred years of national Hebrew life devoid of any literary token or historical writing. And this in the face of the fact that the monuments show the nations about Israel, and contemporaneous with these alleged barren centuries, as being prolific of written thought and record. The discrimination against Israel is ridiculous, not to say invidious.

The character of criticism against which we complain has seldom exhibited the virtue or even the sense of consistency; and here its own inconsistency has been outdone. On the contrary, the way in which the canonical writings have preserved their lines of development and relationship is in itself nothing short of miraculous.

The Mosaic and the post-Mosaic prophecies are equally of divine institution, differing only in degrees of manifestation. The rays of the sun at dawn and at noon are the same. But the meridian warmth increases above that of the dawn. The critical obtuseness of seventy years ago lumped the legislation, history writings and prophecies of Israel into the eighth to the sixth century B. C., showing no regard to the laws of time and thought, and contradicting the record of every one of the principal nations of antiquity.

Such, in the third decade of the twentieth century, is the aspect presented by that contention of radical critical science which is against the integrity of the authors of prophecy. That the whole school has either receded, or has been driven, from the main position occupied by it in the decades immediately preceding the World War is an open secret of scholarship, and especially of that in Germany, where it had its spring, and whence it overran the thought of Christendom.

Elijah is the type transcendant of the Hebrew prophet; as he is the type of the Spirit-led man of all times. If he were not so indubitably human, he might be mistaken for the superman; if he were not so manifestly divine, he might be classed as an enthusiast or supermystic. But the tokens of his humanness and of his prophetic authority are complete. Only fragments of his utterances have found record, and that under the hand of a later chronicler; but his personality looms against Israelitish history like " the excellency of Carmel" against the horizon of Palestine. No man was ever more conscious of the indwelling Spirit; no man was ever trusted with a larger share of the divine prerogative; no man was ever more thoroughly adjusted in gifts and powers to the ends of his sending. With the commitment and speech of John the Baptist; with the soul apartness of Saint Paul, and with the fire of Isaiah, this forerunner of them all pioneered the way for each to enter into the awful loneliness of Jehovah's counsels.

The Tishbite contradicts, but also expounds, all that springs in religious consciousness. Such men are radials of divine truth; the channels through which heaven reaches the earth. It is impossible that scholasticism should understand Elijah. Within bounds fixed by the Spirit, omnipotence lived in his word; he stood to men in the stead of Jehovah; law delimited forces answered to the gestures of his hands, or yielded themselves as the aftermaths of his prayers. "A man of like passions with ourselves," he lived and walked in the Spirit. Before the water-drenched altar of Carmel he prayed: "Hear me, O Jehovah, hear me, that this people may know that thou art Jehovah Elohim."

The theology of the Old Testament was concentrated in that petition; the power pledge of all the ages came in its answer—the fire falling from heaven. Facing a sea of sullen ebbs, and a heaven of brass, spanned above a land parched by three years and six months of drought, he prayed, and there was "a sound of abundance of rain." The very majesty of the recital forbids doubt. "I said in my law, ye are gods."

"Of like passions;" but of personality and frame become unique, through long commitment to the divine and His cause. Covered with body hairs, as a result of continuous outdoor life; strong of limb; lithe of step and bold in action, he outran the chariot of Ahab, defied his corrupt court, and withstood the hatred of idolatrous Jezebel. He was invincible.

But it was only in the might of the Spirit that Elijah held to speak and act; that might for a moment withdrawn, he sank in gloom beneath the juniper tree. It was oscillation between naked power and naked flesh, making it an oracle of human illumination and correction.

The miracles credited to Elijah are, if possible, more easy of belief than Elijah's self. They are bound up in his personality. Given Elijah, and the signs allowed him are natural, reasonable and necessary. It is not surprising that throughout the age of Israelitish and Jewish Messianism, the return of Elijah was constantly expected. It was befitting that, in company with Moses, he should appear in the theophany of the Transfiguration. This imminence of Elijah's name was tragically illustrated in the hour of the crucifixion, when even the guard mistook the word *Eloi* on the lips of the dying Christ for the name of the illustrious prophet of Israel.

The passion of prophecy, as such, reached its full in Isaiah. As to Elijah was given the miracle of power in faith and act; so to Isaiah was given the miracle of vision. "I saw Jehovah," was the climax of that drama in the temple, which was both of personal emotion through the death of Judah's king Uzziah, and of the Spirit-given foresight of the later Pentecost. Isaiah had gone to the tryst of the Spirit in the temple. The fire train of Jehovah filled the house; the doorposts moved, as if shaken by earthquake; celestial tongues woke the silence; living coals of fire were applied to the prophet's lips, and by that token he received his commission to proclaim good tidings to " the holy seed."

The prophecy of Isaiah is the First Gospel, the evangel of the beginning. In its early chapters are found forecasts of the coming of Messiah; and also announcement that a remnant of Israel shall return from captivity and partake of the blessedness of his day. With the seventh chapter (see verse 14) comes the overt prophecy concerning the Bethlehem birth: " Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." This is definitely expanded into what, without controversy, is the most remarkable prophecy in the Old Testament: " Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God (Hebrew, *El Ghibbor*), The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."

The Isaianic prophecy closes with an exultant vision of the gospel age: " Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her all ye that love her. . . . I will extend peace to her and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream." This is the voice of the Spirit definitely uttered eight hundred years before the tragedy of Golgotha and the baptism of Pentecost. The Messianism of the other prophets is in accord with this. Joel, indeed, predicts in clearest terms the fulfilment of the Pentecostal promise: "And it shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."

The men and women of the Christian centuries seldom have been able to realize the meaning and power of the apostolic Pentecost. How little, then, have they been able to read out the prophetic Pentecost? In the unity of these the relevancy and consistency of the Written Word are made to appear. It is only in developing the higher spiritual meanings and historical continuity of the law and the prophecy that a true and enduring basis can be laid for Bible criticism. What, then, must be said concerning interpretation for purposes of worship and personal instruction?

In defining the relationships of Scripture in the national age of Israel, a body of Old Testament literature, other than the prophecies, claims attention. This residuum ranges from the idyls of Ruth and Canticles to the pure philosophy found in parts of Job, and to the ethical precepts and meditations in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Of these, I am selecting the book of Job for particular illustration.

The school of criticism already brought under judgment has contended that Job should be referred to the Persian period of post-exilic times; but the reason assigned therefor is far from being satisfactory. The claim seems to be that Persian Dualism influenced the writing of the prologue to Job. But this certainly will not be received with seriousness. A superficial examination of the terms and metaphors of the prologue will disclose the barrenness of the theory. The prologue is a compositional expedient; a vivid presentation of the influences which are permitted of divine providence to work in the testing out of human life.

The figure of Satan drawn in the prologue cannot be made to take the place of Ahriman in the Parsee Duality. Every law of proportion and logic forbids it. As an interloper in the assembly of the sons of God, the Satan of Job is simply the serpent of the Eden temptation, the lying spirit which entered into the souls of false prophets. His identification is wholly that of the Hebrew Beelzebub, " the crooked serpent," the dragon of the Apocalypse. There is no word in the prologue that, for a moment, can be made to support the idea that Satan is to be regarded as a divinity of any degree, or that he shares, in any sort, the rulership of the world. What he does is only of divine permission.

Elohim, as Creator, and Jehovah, as Spirit and Covenant Keeper, preserve a perfect relationship throughout the book of Job. The impression, indeed, is distinct that the *motif* of the writing is to establish the doctrine of the divine unity in connection with the rule of providence. The idea of righteous and unmerited human suffering, which has its original in the *Kenosis* and the sacrifice devoted Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world, is brought forward and settled on a basis of divine expediency. Likewise is brought to view the doctrine of divine rewards.

The thought of compensational providence was largest in the Hebrew mind at the height of the prosperity of the house of David, the time to which the book of Job seems most properly assigned. It was a voice in appraisal of the compensation which had come to the chosen people in the magnificence of their kingdom. It was a national "Paradise Regained;" a summary of the goodness and mercy of God to the sons of Jacob. The resemblances between the state of the people of Israel and of Job are outstanding features of the drama.

Israel had passed through the night of Egyptian bondage; through the vicissitudes of the wilderness journey, and through the national perils which marked the age of the judges. In the latter of these experiences, they had exchanged one taskmaster for another; through four hundred years of warfare with heathen neighbours, seeing their flocks and harvests swept away by iron-shod invaders; but now they were come into the repose and glory of the reign of Solomon. It was such a time, conjoined with vision, as made a masterpiece possible. There was whereof to proclaim; whereof to write in heroic forms. In an unknown author, if not in Job himself, was found a celebrant, who, in the story, made excellent the praise of that providence which delivered Israel from the ashes of affliction into the joys of peace and compensation.

With Isaiah and the Psalms, the book of Job constitutes a trilogy quite apart in the literature of the Old Testament. The Isaianic prophecies, as we already have appraised them, are measures of transcendence in Scripture; the Psalms of David stand in divine loftiness, as against the crassness and despair of the so-called "Penitential Psalms" of the Babylonians; and

Job is the voice of unquestioning trust, and the answer of the absolute will. In the first place, Job is an echo of most ancient forms and idioms of speech. The antediluvian archons breathe in not a few of its passages. The author was fellow in spirit with the " sons of God," who honoured the days of old; and across his periods lie the footprints of " giants," which were of the ancients. Litanies of the beginning are unmistakable as interludes of his discourses. Such are: " Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth. . . . When I made the clouds the garments thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it? " " When the morning stars sang together? "

If the habitat of Job is to be located in Arabia Deserta, as is, no doubt, correct, the flavour of super-antiquity in its periods is well explained. The uncorrupted monotheism of the early Semites lingered longer in the desert belts of Arabia than elsewhere, except in Palestine; and it is evident that, while the theology of Job agreed with that of Israel, it was derived from an influence or a source extraneous to the soil of Canaan. Job was a man of the East; and, in that fact was found the value of his personality as an expositive of Israel's doctrine of compensation. The meditative temperament of the East was indispensable to the plan of the story. It paralleled the knowledge of the patriarchs and of the lawgiver, and thus made a complete spiritual and inspirational cycle.

The epic drama of Job could not have been written in post-exilic times. The conditions, even the materials, necessary thereto had disappeared. Besides, should one desire a further proof of this, let him compare the chapters of Job with those of any one of the Apocryphal books, products of the post-exilic age, Esdras, Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, and the others, and the impossibility of such origin will be apparent. There was a time when inspiration and opportunity met in the production of this writing; but that was not in the post-exilic period.

Job was a name of unquestioned renown in Israel before the time of Ezekiel, for he associates the man of the East with Noah and Daniel in a strongly determinative passage, one that establishes the historicity of both Job and Daniel, as well as of Noah, and tends to fix the date of each of these in agreement with the claims of tradition.

The book of Job is an abiding evidence of the unity of revelation. In its dissertations, the hopes and sympathies of the Hebrew race found expression, and through them was disclosed a kinship with primæval thought. It is the complement of the book of creation; as also the half-way treatise between the tables of Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. It more than balances Hebrew thought and wisdom against the philosophies of the Greeks and the juridical masteries of the Romans. It reaches a hand backward across the flood of Noah to align itself with the fellowship of the archons, and forward in gestures toward the day of Him who spake as never man spake.

VIII

THE AGE OF JUDAISM

THE age of Judaism may be reckoned to begin with the final downfall of the Davidic monarchy and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple of Solomon by Nebuchadnezzar. With the transfer of the people to Babylon, idolatry was thoroughly stamped out of the nation's heart; and, under the teachings and leadership of the priesthood, a new Israelitish consciousness awoke. The messages of the prophets also came with full force upon the captive race; and the Messianic hope burned with instant and compelling flame. The end of the seventy years of exile was awaited with desire and earnest expectation. The soul of Israel during those weary years in a strange land found its voice in the brief national Iliad contained in the Hebrew Psalter: " By the Rivers of Babylon We Sat Down."

With the return of the exiles to Jerusalem under Nehemiah and Ezra, Judaism was established in the reconfirmation of the law of Moses, and the giving of the religious government into the hands of the high priest. The civil rule was also semi-religious, the governors appointed by Cyrus being wholly committed to the cultic programme.

Admittedly, the prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Daniel belong to the age of Judaism, the last named going to the exilic period, and Haggai and Zechariah being concomitants of the rebuilding of the temple. Malachi was the last full voice of the men of the charisma. He prophesied after the temple's complete restoration. Parts of the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel belong to the exilic period; but their proper classification is with the older prophets. The whole of the Apocrypha is a product of the age of Judaism. These books represent the Judaic soul in the effort to express itself in a new national utterance.

Nebuchadnezzar, the conqueror and enslaver of Judah, was succeeded on the throne of Babylon by his son Evil-merodach, in 462 B. C., in the thirty-seventh year of the captivity. This is told in Second Kings 25:27. An alabaster vase, found at Susa, whither it had been carried by Elamite invaders of Babylon, bears the brief inscription: "Evil-merodach, king of Babylon, son of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon." This is the king who delivered Jehoiakim from prison and set him above all the captive kings at the court of Babylon. Though brief, the inscription of Evil-merodach fits in with the Scripture account, and is confirmatory of its history.

After two years, Evil-merodach was succeeded by Nergal-sarusur, his brother-in-law, who slew him and reigned six years. Labash-Marduk followed him in a reign of nine months. These kings have no mention in the canon. The last titular king of Babylon, Nabonidas, is equally without mention in the chronicles of Israel; but the name of his son, Belshazzar, who shared rulership with him, was written into the centre of those events which closed the drama of Babylonian national history, as told in the prophecy of Daniel. His name also proposes some real problems in Old Testament interpretation. Higher criticism has exhausted its resources in efforts to combat the traditional claims for the prophecy of Daniel; but, as in other instances of conflict, the light of archæology and sane interpretation is dispelling the difficulties.

The chief objection urged against Daniel is that its history is anachronistic and erroneous as to names and dates. For a long time, criticism denied the existence of Belshazzar, classing Daniel's reference to him as an unsupported fiction. But a complete answer is at hand. From a cuneiform inscription of Nabonidas, Rawlinson read the following: "O Sin, lord of the gods of heaven and of earth, god of gods. . . . As to Belshazzar, the first-born son proceeding from my loins, place in his heart fear of Thy divinity." Here is the reality of Belshazzar.

But in Daniel Belshazzar is called the *son* of Nebuchadnezzar. So our English version reads; but the Hebrew form, *abauch*, may mean father, grandfather, or ancestor in any degree. Gesenius gives *grandfather* as the secondary or probable definition. Scholars generally are coming to the conclusion that grandfather is the true reading. Cyrus boasted that he was the grandson of Astyages; and David addresses Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, as the *son* of Saul, who was his grandfather. Nergalsarusur married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, and thus justified his succession to power, after he had murdered his brother-in-law Evil-merodach. That Nabonidas, the father of Belshazzar, married a princess of the house of Nebuchadnezzar now appears certain. So far, therefore, as the Bible use of the word *father* is concerned it designates Belshazzar as the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. There also seems to be strong probability that the mother of Nabonidas was a daughter of Nebopolassar, and that she lived to a great age. As told in the Nabonidas inscription, Belshazzar paused in the midst of his military activities to mourn the death of the king's mother (his own grandmother); which event was signalized as only had become the memory of a king's daughter. This doubly would have related Belshazzar to royalty; as also it would have given further assurance to Nabonidas, the usurper.

Attention also must be given to the dramatic tension of the language in Daniel in which Nebuchadnezzar is referred to as the father of Belshazzar. In Daniel 5:10, the queen speaks to Belshazzar of a man in his kingdom in whom was "the spirit of the holy gods," and who had been made master of the magians by Nebuchadnezzar,—"thy father, the king, I say thy father." This was a royal formula, and was meant to emphasize the dignity and authority precedent in the act of Nebuchadnezzar, and was not meant to state with exactness the royal genealogy.

A tablet from Erech records an oath taken in the name of Nabonidas and Belshazzar, his son, showing that the son was regarded as only lower than, not to say the royal equal of, the father. Being of the blood of Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidas would have seen in Belshazzar an additional stay to his own authority.

Some years before his death, Professor Clay read from a tablet at Yale University, an account of the interpretation of a dream for Nabonidas and Belshazzar. This and other tablets establish the fact of a constant association of the names of these two in such fashion as to be significant of co-royalty, supporting the statement of Daniel that Belshazzar was king in Babylon on the night of its capture by Cyrus the Great. But the crux comes in connection with the whereabouts of Nabonidas at the time of the closing scenes. The proofs are not all in; in fact, may not be in for years to come; perhaps not until the sands of Babylon have been sifted to the last ephah. From one angle, it would seem that Nabonidas was defending another part of his exposed empire, while Belshazzar was in charge at the capital. But should both Nabonidas and Belshazzar have been present in Babylon; and if both, or only one, had perished, the historical correctness of Daniel in no wise would have been affected. Enough is known to assure the position that Belshazzar was there, and in the discharge of royal authority, and no more is claimed in the prophecy.

It has been computed that the feast of Tammuz, the spouse of Ishtar, the great holiday bacchanal of the Babylonians, fell on the night of Belshazzar's overthrow. This would account for the character of the revel in the palace, and the desecration of the captured vessels of the temple of Jehovah, in the worship of Babylonian gods. It would also account for the activity of the Persian army, which had fixed upon this feast-night as one in which the vigilance of the city's defenders particularly would be relaxed. There are other angles to the criticism of Daniel; but with this settlement of its historic integrity the residue of objection disposes of itself.

The prophecies of Isaiah concerning Cyrus the Great was once a thorn in the side of pragmatism. At the cost of intricate pains, a critical theory was constructed by which these troublesome prophecies were resolved into exilic history; but, more and more, they approve themselves as eighth century predictions, and not as exilic afterthoughts. These prophecies, as they relate to Cyrus, and his zeal for the return of the Jews, are specific: " Even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid " (Isa. 44:28). These words are fully echoed in the inscriptions of Cyrus, two centuries later, from which is read: "All their (captive) people I assembled and returned to their dwellings." This involved the return of the Jewish people.

The historical support of what becomes the climax of Daniel's prophecy is one of the triumphs of the Bible. Whether Daniel be put early or late, the result is the same, so far as the testimony of history is related to it. In chapter 2:31-45 is the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the image of gold, of silver, of brass, of iron and clay. The separate metals of this image represented the four universal empires of history, Babylonian-Assyrian, Persian, Grecian and Roman. This vision is repeated in 7:2-14, the four dominions being represented under the forms of four beasts; the first, a winged lion; the second, a bear; the third, a leopard, also winged; and the fourth, a beast, "dreadful and terrible," with "great iron teeth." These are palpably the same four powers.

Unfriendly criticism seemed to experience a sense of relief when a way of referring Daniel to the Maccabean period appeared to open. This brought the prophecy down to 168–165 B. C. But, again, the case was not helped. Daniel belongs to the ages. Its vivid and detailed anticipations of Roman history culminate only in the events of the fifth century A. D. Also, the Roman empire, as such, dates only from 30 B. C., a hundred and twenty years and more, later than the latest date which the critics dare to suggest for Daniel. Who other than an inspired man could have known these things even at that date? The date of Daniel is the sixth century B. C.

The rise of the Persian empire marked the turning point in the fortunes of the Jewish exiles in Babylon. It was no less the turn of the tide in world history. The throne of Cyrus sharply indicates the median line between the most ancient life of the race and the long centuries of trend toward modern world conditions. With Persian rule, Judaism, already emergent, became operative in thought and ideal; the age of prophecy reached its close; and the way for the coming of Christianity slowly was being prepared. Greek philosophy and art were taking form and expression in a still sequestered land; while the Greek spirit, unconsciously, was entering into discipline against the time when to Greece should fall the sceptre of world rule. Conquest and dominion were changing from the truculence of pillage and oppression to a semblance of racial sympathies and home rule throughout a cohesive empire. The provision made by Cyrus for the return of the Jews, as of other conquered peoples, was a striking example of that tendency. Absolute as was the Persian power, it presaged a continuous face forward of time in human advancement. The predictions of the prophets already were beginning to be fulfilled.

We have seen how, in the conquest of Nineveh and Babylon by the Medes and Persians, was fulfilled the words of Genesis: " Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem and Canaan shall be his servant." The whole Babylonian-Assyrian population of Mesopotamia was composed of titular Semites; but the eponymous founder of their empire was Nimrod, a descendant of Canaan, the son of Ham. With the fall of Babylon, every Semitic nation, great and small, passed to vassalage under the rule of Persia, the first of the great Japhethic powers. This was the beginning of unending Japhethic dominion. With the exception of the independent Arabic state founded by Mohammed this vassalage has been unbroken. Such exceptions as the petty principality of the Maccabees and the pre-Roman kingdom of Herod the Great do not count.

The dominion of western Asia, in time, passed from the Persians to the Greeks, and then from the Greeks to the Romans. The mandate rule over these lands today is in the hands of the English and the French; so that for twenty-five hundred years past descendants of the Japhethic race have dwelt in the tents of Shem and have constrained service from the offspring of Canaan.

Herodotus, who saw the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, while yet much of its glory remained, has left us such descriptions of its greatness and extent as agree with the impressions made upon our minds by the accounts of Scripture. As the Father of History saw Babylon, it later came under vassalage to his countrymen. Greek overlords ruled it from the palaces of Nebuchadnezzar. Greek military masters impressed, or enrolled, the descendants of Canaan for distant enterprises of arms or labour, or profited by their cultivation of the irrigated fields of Babylon.

Two events happening in the age of Judaism have a direct and important bearing on the history of the Old Testament. These are the settlement of the Hebrew canon and its later translation into the Greek Codex, known as the Septuagint, or Seventy.

The time and manner of the formation of the Jewish canon, that is, of the putting together of the Old Testament books of Scripture in continuous relation, is a subject invested with much obscurity. But that these books were intelligently and systematically so arranged does not admit of doubt. The confidence of rabbinical antiquity concerning the forming of the canon is itself the strongest human support that can be conceived of. Then the translation of these books into Greek, not exceeding a century and a quarter after the time of Malachi, is a fact whose importance is not to be undervalued. Some critics have concluded that the Old Testament canon was fixed by Ezra, or, at least, in his time; but this is without dependable evidence; and, in fact, is chronologically impossible, in view of the date of Malachi. What is certain, in the last analysis, is that the canon formed itself under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, who inspired the books in their initial writing and directed them to their final repository. This does not exclude the offices of human judgment and reverent selectiveness which must be presupposed in any view of canonical origin. But what amounts to a safe conclusion is, that the canon was formed soon after the close of the prophetic era, that is, with the message of Malachi. When the Jewish teachers, priests and others, realized that the prophecies were ended, they naturally provided for the validation of the other recognized sacred compositions. These, with the law and the prophets, became the Hebrew Bible, as after ages have known it. No exact date can be fixed for this final naming of the Old Testament writings; nor can it be certain that the decision was reached within a narrowly limited time. It well might have covered the better part of a century. This would further indicate that it was of the direction of the divine prescience.

Volumes on volumes have been written on the history, or, it may be said, the lack of history, relating to this point. But with comfort of mind and reassurance of faith, the devout student may accept the finished revelation as being testimony not only to its own message but also to the integrity of its putting together. The fortunes which produced it have attended it through its centuries of existence, and will deliver it to the ages.

What seems proper to be said here is, that the best evidence to be invoked on the date of the formation of the Old Testament canon, and the appearance of the Seventy, further discounts the critical jugglery which has sought to refer several of the sacred books, notably, Daniel, Job, Joel and Jonah, to a date not earlier than the second century B. C.

From the best information remaining to us, especially as furnished by Josephus, the Greek, or Septuagint, translation is to be credited to Ptolemy Philadelphus, the Greek emperor of Egypt, whose reign fell between 285–247 B. C. This ruler, incited by his librarian, Demetrius of Phalerium, is said to have procured the services of seventy-two Jerusalem doctors or scribes, who completed the work of translation in seventy-two consecutive days. This was in pursuance of the already well established rule of the Alexandrian emperors to secure a copy of every notable manuscript in the world. It was in this way that the library of Alexandria became the richest and most famous bibliothique of the ancient world.

It is possible that the story concerning Philadelphus and his librarian is not wholly dependable; but it is, by odds, the most trustworthy point of reckoning that has been furnished us. Also it fits into the history of the Scriptures during the exilic and post-exilic times. All the circumstances considered, the finished canon, the large Jewish population at Alexandria and the literary zeal for additions to the library of the new city, that which is said to have happened is the most logical and natural that can be imagined.

The great number of Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria from the very founding of the city, in the fourth century B. C., would doubly argue the need for a Greek translation of the Bible, or important sections of it, at a time prior even to that of Philadelphus. The Jewish temple and scrolls at Elephantiné, which immediately followed on the settlement of a Jewish colony there, indicate the zeal and habit of the dispersion. All the evidence would seem to place the finished Greek Codex, or Septuagint, at a date not later than 250 B. C., or nearly a century after the founding of the city. This date, as we have before noted, disposes of a number of critical objections to traditional datings of Scripture authorship. It also tends to put all the Jewish canonical books within the accepted cycle of inspiration, which closed with Malachi at the end of the fifth century B. C.

The different problems that beset Septuagint history and relationships cannot be denied; but one complete answer can be made to even the most obdurate of these; and that is, that inspiration is not claimed for this Greek rendering. The Jews of the Maccabean and early Christian periods did make this claim; but later rabbinical schools have rejected the codex altogether; and Christians have never regarded it as possessing divine authority. Nevertheless, it has been greatly venerated throughout its history, and has often been relied upon in important cases of conflict with the Massoretic, or rabbinical, Hebrew text. Also during the time of our Lord and His apostles, the *Koine* Greek being the common speech of the Roman empire, the Septuagint was in general use; and was, no doubt, the version commonly read; and it was from it that the New Testament writers constantly made quotation.

It is well known that the Septuagint, as it came into the hands of Christians, and long before the Christian era, contained the Apocrypha. These latter writings were not at any time generally accepted as Scripture by the Jewish rabbis. It is also noteworthy that the New Testament writers make no reference to them. The Roman Catholic Church has retained them as canonical; but the Protestant confessions have uniformly excluded them.

From the very obscure record which we possess, it is difficult to make any observation on the inclusion of the Apocrypha that will not be open to objection; but since it appears clear that even the canonical books were not all translated at once (as the Ptolemy story would indicate), the Apocryphal section was a later accretion. The books of Maccabees could not have come in before near the end or middle of the second century B. C. But this, by no means, argues that the law and the prophets, with the historical and subsidiary Scriptures, were not contained in their entirety in the earlier version. The persistency with which criticism has held to a late second century date for the whole Septuagint is too plainly to bring into question the claims of the exilic and early post-exilic books of the traditional Hebrew canon.

For critical uses, the Apocrypha has little value. It need not be considered by the Bible student as affecting any elemental teaching of inspiration, or as, in any way, belonging to its historical development. Evangelical Christianity has wisely decided to remove it entirely from the field of Scripture consideration.

IX

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

THE story of Jesus the Christ, as contained in the Four Gospels, needs no confirmation of outside testimony. History can add nothing to its content; science can bring no increment to its verities. Indeed, the name of the Galilean must validate the epochs of history; as his wisdom must give direction to the goings of science. Time, as it passes, reflects the glory of His kingdom, and attests His power to build with naked hands of love. What was done and said by Him in the beginning was not confined to a corner, and today is more manifest than it was in the days of the regeneration. The tokens of Him, as held of time and place, have their use, and a divine one, yet He Himself is superior to time and place, leading the ages and principalities in perpetual captivity.

The Galilean is larger than even the Gospel portrait of Him, yet every stroke in that portrait is of divine instigation, a projection of the Life which was the light of men. For the needs of men it was made complete, and any subtraction from it must mar that completeness, and defeat the purpose of its giving. If the New Testament is to mean all things, indeed, if it is to mean anything, in the future of Christian consciousness and belief, it must be accepted in its entirety. On this basis only can actuality be built; and actuality is the final tenet of belief. The Gospel must stand as a body of absolute facts, or fail altogether. Fail, it cannot, and therefore must, and will, maintain itself in the integrity of its every recital. The Incarnation was a fact, as was also its inseparable cognate, the Virgin Birth; the Bodily Resurrection was a fact; and, likewise, the Blood Atonement, and the Ascension. Acceptance of these, considered as the content of faith, is Christianity; nothing else is; nothing else can be. This is the finality of both the letter and spirit of the Scriptures.

Scholastic demand often has been made for the centreing of theological thought about the historic Christ. This, all but uniformly, has involved mental reservations. It has implied a lack of complete historicity in the written Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. But the reverse is true. These writings are history, terse, absolute. It is impossible to show that any one part of them is less historical than the other parts. In them the Christ dwells bodily, though superextensively, overflowing into all fulness. It constantly becomes apparent that the Gospel writers have so conducted their narratives as to obscure by no touch or word the transcendent Personality they seek to reveal; and, by parity, to leave unrecorded no single fact needed to show the Christ in redeeming fulness.

The rashness, therefore, which leads men, protesting evangelical loyalty, to elide elemental sections of the Gospel narrative, under alleged annullment of science, can adequately be assessed only when their logic is brought to bear upon other parts of the record. According to a theology now prevalent in large sections of the evangelical churches in America, no part of the Gospel is inviolable. It is all equally chaff to the wind, and as dust in the balance of human toleration.

To say, as does this school, that Christ, being larger than the written Gospel, can be apprehended outside of it is to indulge a prideful and pompous utterance; while to allege that the Gospel is defective as to fact and proof; and, therefore, Christ must be apprehended in spite of the existing written Gospels, is scandalous, even impious, in the face of truth. From whence shall come compensation for those parts of the Gospels commended to discard? Also who is to appraise that which is to take their place? Or let a diviner interrogative voice the demand: "Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above) or who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring Christ again from the dead) . . . The word is nigh thee . . . that is, the word of faith which we preach." This word can have no substitution, no amendment. With its Forerunner Christ, it has entered into the settled judgment of eternity.

But the Word which dwelt for a time with men left an ineradicable memory upon the places which witnessed His presence and passing. Perhaps no spot on earth, connected with the enduring thought of humanity, is so well validated as is the manger site at Bethlehem; but if there could be ground of question as to the identity of that site, a larger identity lives in the faith and knowledge of those to whom the birth of the King of the Jews was infallibly on the wise, and at the time, described in the Gospels.

Nor is there felt need for concurrent proof of the boyhood and manhood life at Nazareth. Proof there is; but the higher tradition proceeds from within. In the restored synagogue at Nazareth (now a Latin church), one well may assure himself that he stands upon the very stones where stood the Son of Mary when He expounded the prophecy concerning Himself. At the Fountain of the Virgin, the memory of the Holy Lad is more real than the sound of the gushing waters. Below the fountain, along the rill that issues from it, where, as the Apocryphal Gospel relates, He played with youthful companions, making clay pigeons and clay oxen, His presence is more delightsome than the odours of over-branching oleanders and myrtles.

On the pavement of the temple, still in evidence, one may locate, with a fair degree of certainty, the once cloistered area where the Boy Christ talked with the lawyers and doctors. Walking by the shores of Galilee, it requires no promptings or reassurance of critical judgment to cause to live again the days of miracle and parable. The land, indeed, is the Fifth Gospel; but its Gospel aspects are projections from the Gospel written of the Spirit within.

With feelings of devout certitude, one may stand beneath the olives of Gethsemane, where the Suffering Servant poured out His soul in passion. From the Pavement of Pilate to Golgotha is now not wholly a doubtful walk, while the very Place of a Skull is removed from the realm of bald conjecture, as is also the tomb in which they laid Him, with the thymy sod of Olivet, whence He ascended. But both this outward and inward testimony depend upon the Written Word. Except that Word had been given, the proof on the face of the land, and in the keeping of days, long ago had disappeared, and the response from within had never been. In living through the tragic drama of the Galilean's final offering up, though one stood in the Garden, on the Pavement of Pilate, walked the Via Dolorosa, confronted Calvary, stood within the Sepulchre of Scopus, where He well may have lain, and which well may have been the actual scene of His rising; or stood on the nether slope of Olivet, whence He ascended, one must needs enter into another, though not more real, process than the one gone through at Galilee. But, always, the record which God gave of His Son remains steadfast. It was the word spoken by angels.

This leads to the conclusion that it would be a work of supererogation to seek to apply to the New Testament the same character of proofs as those used in dealing with Old Testament fact and history. Nevertheless, New Testament criticism has a real and decisive setting; as also a real and decisive settlement of its claims has gone to record. Not a few points of contest in Old Testament interpretation persist; but the New Testament, with reference to both textual and historical criticism, has won its battle. Every book in the Christian canon, it safely may be said, has been accounted for. The chief critical onset of the past, represented in the Tubingan school of more than half a century ago, was determined and spirited; but the hypothesis of second century New Testament origins was quickly exploded; and, with the passing of the Tubingan leader, Ferdinand Christian Baur, the cohesion dissolved and the ordeal was over. Only, as elsewhere has been observed, the remnants of the discounted Tubingan school, particularly in this country, have taken refuge in the neo-psychological doctrine of subjectivism, which, while admitting the apostolic authorship of the New Testament books, has ascribed their contents, in large measure, to fondness and tendency in apostolic faith. The contention thus risked is that, in order to account for the extraordinary qualities and character manifestations of the Galilean Teacher, after His death, the apostolic community invented, or unconsciously developed, those Gospel stories which carry claims of His Godhood, and of the accordant miracles of His ministry and rising. The Four Gospels, according to this contention, are no more than the results of Apostolic initiative in passing upon the originals of the Galilean history. It is therefore now in order for each believer to pass, in the same manner, upon the Gospels thus originated, so as to detect and eliminate the elements of fondness and tendency. Ostensibly, the conclusions of science are made an excuse for this pillage of the Gospel narrative; but reasons of every colour and degree are liable to be invoked. Indeed, they are being invoked.

It is on this basis that men are being taught to reject the doctrines of the Virgin Birth, the Bodily Resurrection and the Blood Atonement, and to substitute for each any what that may accord with a self-sufficient subjective mind. Before this attitude the great essential doctrines of repentance, regeneration, and sactification also must go down, or else be turned into shadows of ethical reaction. The power of the Gospel is in its radical appeal to conscience and faith from the viewpoint of manifested Godhood, miraculous emphasis upon sin from the human side, and of grace from the side of the divine. Incarnation, blood atonement and miraculous redemption are the only forms that this manifestation logically or morally could have taken; and, in its record of these, the New Testament is exact and faithful.

Stronger than any scholastic arguments, or any concurrent proofs coming through science or particular history, is the instant, steady and still persisting advance of the Gospel, as from its beginning. It was given of the Father to the Son to have life in Himself; and to His Gospel the Son has given to have life in itself. This self-contained life is the largest appraisement of the Written Word.

The Resurrection was not only the climax of Gospel testimony and power; but became the point of the going out of the evangel to conquest and self-revealment. The meaning and power of the Resurrection are seen not only in the fact that it accounts for a transcendent life in the Crucified; but also that in His bodily revival and return to Galilean life, as it had been revealed to men in the Transfiguration, was the basis of historical and eternal redemption for men. Moreover, the Bodily Resurrection completed the self-revelation of Godhood, which from eternity regarded itself from

e viewpoint of perfected humanity. Without the
isen Body the revelation from this viewpoint had
een an empty pledge.

To attempt in this day to prove from scientific prem-
es the Bodily Resurrection would be like attempting
prove the existence of light. Despite the belated
fforts of subjectivism, it is self-evident and foregone in
e faith of the ages. If the Christian mind could
holly deliver itself from the error of putting the
hrist resurrection in the same category as that of the
esurrection of men, all difficulty would disappear.
he bodies of men, polluted and depraved through sin,
ust be changed and glorified; but the body of the
hrist, which was the tabernacle of indwelling God-
ood, and which was untouched of sin, had no need of
hange. It was always glorious. The Transfiguration,
little understood, even by Christian teachers, showed
e body of the Christ as it was from His birth to His
scension. He did not need to be glorified. The Scrip-
re is in point and conclusive: “ Made like unto his
wn glorious body.” Herein is contained the whole doc-
ine of the Resurrection of Christ and the redeemed.

As the Gospel could have had no rational beginning
xcept in the Virgin Birth, so it could have had no ra-
onal completion except in the Bodily Resurrection.
oth are miracles, operating on matter to the end of
ompletely etherealizing and transmuting it into condi-
ons of unchanging consistency. The Virgin Birth and
e continuing Incarnation issued in the perfect spiritual
ody, and the Resurrection restored it from death to its
ransfiguration state. In that Transfiguration state it

ascended up above all heavens, to sit down forever at the right hand of God. In the recital of these facts the Scriptures are faithful and consistent.

After the Resurrection, Pentecost becomes the most significant event in the Gospel cycle. Alike, the Resurrection and the Pentecost are perpetual sources of life and renewal to spiritual men. The enduement of Pentecost was both history and prophecy. The verdict of Scripture is definite to the point that there will be no suspension of Pentecost until the Church is exalted to the presence of its Lord in the heavenlies. In those heavenlies, Pentecost will be the enduring atmosphere.

As the Resurrection revealed the Almightiness of the Son; so Pentecost revealed the Almightiness of the Spirit. The Resurrection quickened the Galilean body into eternal mastery; while Pentecost quickened the Church into perpetual experience and testimony. The purpose of Pentecost was to manifest the Personality of the Spirit; to show Him as the interpreter of truth and the source of spiritual life and power. The second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is the spiritual dynamo of the ages. The baptism of fire and the gift of tongues answered to conditions superlatively spiritual. As the Transfiguration was a pre-Resurrection manifestation; so Pentecost, with its tokens of tongues and fire, pledged the Spirit in perpetual ministry.

The miraculous character of Pentecost is not open to debate. It was of one substance with the inspiration of the prophets, the Incarnation and the miracles of the Galilean ministry. But as an experience within the Christian life, the Pentecostal infilling was normal to that which is essentially and continuously miraculous. It is not difficult to measure, in some significant wise, the difference between the intellectual and spiritual apprehension of the disciples before Pentecost and afterwards. Before the Baptism their understaning of the Scriptures was confused and inarticulate; the enduement not only vitalized their knowledge of the prophecies and other divine writings, but also brought to their remembrance the things which had been spoken of the Lord in the Galilean walk. Great emotions, great experiences are necessary to great thoughts. The truth of the Gospel, the tragedy of the Crucifixion, the glory of the Resurrection, the mystery of the Ascension, call for a great expositive in the way of impact on intellect and emotion. Pentecost became that impact. Men who passed through it could never return to their former states and selves.

Moreover, the Pentecost was tremendously sanctifying. Putting aside the crude theorizings of certain modern sects, which put the article of sanctification in Pentecost, it remains that the baptism of the Spirit, which is the living and continuous token of the enduement, is always sanctifying. It comes after regeneration, in which sanctification is begun; but it gives instant and powerful momentum to the sanctification already begun of the Spirit.

Primarily, the baptism of the Spirit is empowerment for work, and is the privilege of those already in the sanctification. This was the nature of the Master's baptism, concerning which He said: “ The spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." He needed no sanctification, who was Himself both "Sanctification and Redemption;" but He sought anointing for His work, for the healings and signs which were to expound and support His ministry, miracles in the most absolute sense; as also for the office of His redemptive sympathies and sacrifices for men.

Pentecost is the manner of Christian living; in fact, it is the Christian life. True Christian experience is dynamic and continually baptismal. All that the first Pentecost meant to the apostolic group, its resurgences has meant to many passionate souls, as also oftentimes to the Church as a whole, in the passing of the ages.

No measure or valuation of the Pentecost could be considered complete without considering the effect which it had upon the multitudes who witnessed it. The record informs us that "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven," who were attracted to the disciples through hearing them "speak in their tongues the wonderful works of God." The adhesion of three thousand of these, in connection with the hundred and twenty Galileans, formed the earliest congregation of the apostolic church. Pentecost is, therefore, both subjective and objective, intensive and extensive. It creates the body of testimony; it secures reaction from the uncommitted world. With its momentum, the apostolic church drove its way through the adamant of pagan opposition.

The work of the Spirit in the Pentecost parallels that of the Son in the Atonement. It is personal, direct, complete. The Atonement secures redemption; Pentecost seals it in sanctification and power. Jesus Christ is the source of forgiveness; the Holy Ghost is the source of regeneration, the new life. One cannot occur without the other. Forgiveness is continuous; so also is the new birth. These are the fundamentals of Pentecost. The witness of the Spirit is the individualization of Pentecost. When the direct witness deepens and multiplies, the general baptism comes nearer to realization.

A philosophy of the plan of salvation is developed very early in the writings of St. Paul. The beginnings of this philosophy are seen in the Epistle to the Romans. There the physical, the psychic, and the moral problems of human nature are treated with the severity of philosophical inquiry. The why of history, at least as to its depressed and abortive movements, is accounted for in the fact of sin, which to St. Paul's mind had become a method of world history. With the discovery of sin—a fact unknown to the old philosophers, and but imperfectly revealed to the prophets—the apostle was able to account for the currents of life which in all past history had flowed so steadily downward. And to him came also an ever-growing understanding of the nature of sin. It was at bottom the choice against God. The nations had put God out of their thoughts, not through excusable ignorance, but in "knowing God they glorified him not." The old world knew crime, that is offense against the state, but not sin, which is against God. That knowledge the Gospel brought. In the light of this revelation, St. Paul saw the logic of all the past histories of men. But the Gospel brought also the power of renewal to human consciousness and the means of righteousness through the personal enthronement of Christ. The doctrine of justification by faith was a necessary and divinely-attested corollary of this. The conditions in the church at Corinth furnished new material for the advance of this subjective process going on in the apostle's mind; though, in fact, that process was one with the details of his public preaching. At Corinth there were saints in embryo; the old-world sense of idolatrous degradations described in the first chapter of Romans had not been wholly shaken from their souls. Babes they were of the life of a perfect manhood prophesied in the evangel, and objectified in the apostle's later contrast of the old and the new man. He could be tenderly patient with those half-Christianized pagan converts, not only because he was constrained of love, but because he saw the whole of the divine plan in life and history, and because that plan included these as " called to be saints." His first great concept of the Gospel was of its dynamical power—his own experience enforced that; but he saw it also as the sure beginning of life, not only in the macrocosm of being, but in the humblest and weakest convert apart.

By the time St. Paul had come to the writing of Ephesians he saw the universe as the habitat of the race of spiritual men. The ages were answering in his thought to the programme of the kingdom of Messiah. He had now completed his meditation on the human side of the Gospel's self-fulfilment. His soteriology prophetically and finally reversed the old-world order of life; and he foresaw the emergence of a purified and perfected race: " Till we all attain unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

This is the measure or the tide-mark of Ephesians; but perfect as was the soteriology of his vision which was only the end or the entering in of his philosophy of the world, there yet remained to St. Paul the perfecting of his Christology—the fulness of the vision of the Son. That came in Colossians, in language which must be Paul's, since no mortal mind beside his has held the power of its symbols. The order of the epistles is the order of this philosophy-vision of history, crowned with the absolute Christology. St. Paul could not have written Colossians in A. D. 60, when he wrote Romans; nor would he have been led to write Romans in A. D. 64, when he finished the letter to the Colossians. In the first, he posited his philosophy of the divine plan in history; in the latter, it came to the categories of the absolute in thought and truth. Of these, Christ is the All in All.

There is no painter's portrait of Jesus Christ the Son of God. No master of the brush ever limned in colours or traced in lines of light and shade a counterfeit of that rapt and deathless face. But the retentive emotions and memories of those who in the days of the regeneration companied with the Galilean availed to put in words such a portraiture of Him as makes both His divine and human completeness to be forever seen. Much more did the added vision of St. Paul—not less a Galilean experience—when it had wrought to its full, serve as an inspiration to the same end. The logic of the evangel, as its record is preserved in the Acts, leads us to look for the perfect portrait of the Messiah in the epistles of St. Paul. This portrait is found reposing where that order indicates it should be—in the last, the richest, and most eloquent of the apostle's letters to the churches, the Epistle to the Colossians. Quite appropriately, too, the language of this epistle is compressed, while its descriptions become overt and absolute. In fact, language never more completely commanded the offices of art, and yet never so completely transcended art. The image of the invisible God, the incarnate Firstborn of every creature, is therein perfectly revealed.

The uniqueness and surpassing merit of the picture which constitutes the central member of this epistle is that it realizes on the scale of eternal vastness what afterwards became the ideal of the old Latin masters who sought to associate with their pictures of the Christ the temptations, hopes, and loyalties of discipleship, by presenting in mystic groupings about their central colours the faces and forms of saints. The Colossian picture of Jesus is the masterpiece of revelation; but in the glow and sympathy which shade off from its theme of themes are grouped the details of a humanity personal, general, and characteristic, but aligned to the picture's divinest element through the logic of grace.

The Epistle to the Colossians is the revelation of the eternal personality of Christ, the record of His unending being and Lordship. It is not a mere catalogue of Messianic characteristics, not a résumé of the phenomena marking the advance of the Messianic kingdom, but the output of a soul-consciousness long glowing, but now become incandescent through the indwelling of the life and power of the Son of God. Both the matter of the epistle and the moods of the writer were ordained of the Spirit to produce a divine climax.

This will suggest the value of Colossians as data for an estimate of the significance of the whole body of Pauline theology. It will show that theology as the evolution both of a personal experience and of a revelation of the divine essence and glory in Jesus Christ. For this use the individual quality of the epistle receives an increment from the important fact that it is, as already suggested, the last member of that group of writings referred to the apostle's first imprisonment. This places the epistle's completion at a time when the author's meditations, born of long-constrained inactivity and secret soul-triumph, conspired with the hope of early liberation to lift his powers to a point of supreme regnancy. The third-heaven experience of a former exaltation was transcended, not in spiritual joy, it may be, but in a wider vision and a more intimate and sight-impelling realization of Christ as He is in the glory of God the Father.

One thing which constantly impresses the student of St. Paul's writings is doubly suggested in this epistle, namely, that while the language is always tenderly personal where the pastoral contact is made, and never wants point and instruction, it is always larger than the accusative moment or occasion. The arrow goes unerringly through the target, but invariably speeds an immeasurable flight beyond. Sometimes the vastness of the message seems all but disparaged in its temporal objective. This impression results from a fixed method of St. Paul in his writing. The consciousness in which his thought originates is always twofold; the ministry to which it is directed is of time and place, but the language in which it is expressed is matched from the terms of eternity and the kingdom of whose dominion there is no end. In the Colossian letter there are touches and pledges of pastoral sympathy and personal interest; but from these, as from secondary elevations, spring the mountain climaxes of an absolute revelation. A panorama of ages, principalities, powers, fulnesses, and invisibilities dwarf into molehill squalour the Asiatic syncretism against which the message is directed. But this contrast, in some proportion, is observed throughout the course of revelation, both of the old and the new dispensation. The evangel is not the cribbed and measured answer to any given time; but is a prophecy of the glory to be revealed in the ages to come.

Of this quality of his message the critics have freely assumed that St. Paul was unconscious. It is a boldness in which we have no desire to share. The fact is a secret as deep as life, and who is there who has wherewithal to draw therefrom? The personal psychology of St. Paul is as much a study as is his theology. Both his psychology and his theology move through realms that were out of sight, not only because of an exceptional personality, but because of the processes of an exceptional revelation. How, then, are the two to be separated? "My gospel" is the formula of a confidence which does not suggest self-assertion or irreverence; but who besides in all the centuries has dared to share in the proclamation of it? In the Pauline psychology the bearer of the message was inseparable from the message itself; more properly, he was lost in the message; and if he was not consciously answering and voicing the universal soul of faith, he at least felt the weight of earthly and cosmic ages impinging on his words, while he exhorted the too carnal children of his Gentile ministry. The canonical destiny of the epistle became a care of the Divine Spirit. It was a canon in itself.

The occasion of writing the Epistle to the Colossians was accidental, and yet out of that element of accident came the ultimate symbol of revelation; nor that only, but to the Church came the means of apprehending the ultimate mystery of the personality of Jesus. Formularies were exhausted and language was called to its final pledge when St. Paul exhibited that mystery in the declaration: "In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In this utterance revelation fulfilled itself. It was meet that Colossians should be the culminating Pauline writing. The apostolic mind had completed the cycle of its meditations; there remained no other oracular message for the Church; certainly none for the gathering together of the Gentiles. The pastoral epistles, separated from Colossians by the hiatus of a new Pauline activity, are properly concerned with administrative and canonical matters, albeit they themselves pass beyond the temporalities which called them forth into the realm of prophecy, and betray an interest in the remoter spiritual destiny.

Few incidents of New Testament history are more familiar to the average student than those which led to the writing of the Epistle to the Colossians. During the latter part of the first imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome, a runaway slave, named Onesimus, who had probably known the apostle through his having been a guest in the home of his master, Philemon, came to Rome, and seeking out the distinguished prisoner, was by him taken in hand and made a convert. Becoming an apt disciple and being intelligent and loyal, he won in a peculiar way the affection and confidence of his teacher, and became his companion and trusted helper. It was characteristic of St. Paul's ideal of conduct that he determined to send the ex-slave back to his master for a personal reconciliation. This design connected itself with another plan of the apostle, and one of vaster significance. Epaphras, who during the Ephesian ministry of St. Paul had been one of his co-labourers, and who had planted the church in Colosse, had been sent to Rome a prisoner, and was probably sharing the privileged detention of the apostle in his "own hired house." He had brought a report concerning the Colossian Christians which commended their love and charity, but which carried a disturbing note as to the perils to which they were being exposed from the presence of subverting teachers whose tenets blended the philosophical occultism of the East with the traditional rites of Judaism. The fact that Philemon, whose home had formerly been in Ephesus, was now a resident of Colosse suggested to St. Paul that Onesimus, in returning, should bear to the church in that city a letter of comfort and warning. This letter may have been, and probably was, finished after the inditing of the personal message to Philemon. The sequences which we have supposed would make that order a certainty.

With Onesimus in this mission was associated Tychicus, another trusted disciple who had already been retained for a similar service to the near-by church of the Ephesians. It may be of interest to refer in this place to a circumstance which seems to add weight to the supposition which we have adopted concerning the finality of the letter to the Colossians. The only other writing of a general character which the critics have placed later than it is the Epistle to the Ephesians. By an almost unanimous agreement the letter of which St. Paul speaks in Colossians as the letter to the Laodiceans is the same as the Epistle to the Ephesians which is now believed to have been a circular message meant for a number of churches in Asia Minor. Ephesians expressly says that this letter was to be borne by the hand of Tychicus singly; but the letter to the Colossians by its own terms was committed jointly to Tychicus and Onesimus, showing, as we think, a later arrangement. No disruptive or specially disturbing condition at Ephesus called for a letter; but it appears to have been a long meditated design of the apostle to communicate to the Ephesians the state of his mind and the result of his meditations upon that Gospel through which they had been quickened out of the death of sin into the life of faith and holiness. This letter, therefore, having been finished and made ready for dispatch, the Colossian " burden " followed quickly, and hence the inevitable consequence of striking resemblances and complementing peculiarities of these resulted. The resemblances and coincidences have given rise to a multitude of speculations and theorizings on the part of modern critics, the most of which are rather curious than either instructive or engaging. Some have held the notion of the priority in writing of the letter to the Colossians, and have regarded Ephesians as simply an enlargement of its details; others have seen in Colossians an epitome of Ephesians; and still others have questioned the Pauline authorship of either one or the other as a whole, contending that the originals consisted of only the briefer personal details as now read, and that these were built upon and interpolated by zealous Paulinists of the second century. This theory is based upon what is assumed to be Gnostic elements in the " philosophy " and " rudiments " against which Colossians warns. There has been a world of this kind of speculation; but candid and reverent students have come to know of how little value such theorizings are, the most plausible outputs of which fail of convincing force by reason of the amazing differences of the critics themselves.

Not only are the resemblances of the two epistles natural, but their differences are logical, and it is the quality of these differences—the advanced apocalyptic vantage of Colossians—that to our mind fixed the shorter as the later of the two writings. Ephesians is a chart of that universe which is the habitat of the race of spiritual men, and draws its signs and parallels along a level of ethical and spiritual teaching; while Colossians is the heraldry book of the Firstborn and heaves its periods into the transcendence of a final utterance. The one follows the other as realization follows desire.

So little has the canonicity of Colossians been in question, that the subject needs hardly to be broached. Together with the briefer letter to Philemon, it has enjoyed from the beginning of the canon almost complete immunity from attack. It was left for a few modern specialists like Pfleiderer, Hildenfeldt, and Weizsäcker to raise the inane issue of the *hapax legomena*, and to call up the anachronistic ghost of Gnosticism, and from this viewpoint to make an assault upon the Pauline authorship. We find it desirable to devote a few sentences to the study of the nature of the Colossian heresy which has been so confidently identified with Gnosticism, and thus made a reason for assigning at least a part of the epistle to the second century.

It is now a well-ascertained fact that the cult or system to which the Gnostics gave their name existed in one form or another prior to the Christian era, so that if any one or a section of the Colossian heresies should be identified with some form of early Gnosticism, the result need not be surprising, and certainly does not constitute an argument against the Pauline authorship of the epistle. But it cannot be shown that these tendencies came from any source that directly contributed to the Gnostic creed. We have already suggested that the Colossian heretics were syncretists, a fact which is derived from the simplest interpretation of the record itself. Wherever a Christian church was established in the apostolic age there, at once, appeared Judaizing teachers—pundits with itching ears, and often itching palms—and almost invariably their diversions were influenced by the dominant intellectual atmosphere of the paganism about them. At Colosse the situation was a typical one. The city was on the high road of commerce between the Ægean coast and the Euphrates valley. Jewish synagogue life was well developed along this ancient highway; the Neoplatonism of Alexandria, modified by the cult of the Ephesian Artemis, was pressing from the side of paganism. The Christian community was in a strait betwixt the two. Jewish ordinances and observances, especially the Rabbinical feast-day rites—a thing seductive to the Asiatic mind—were being urged upon immature Christian converts; while the occultism and astral tenets of the Alexandrian creed—an ancient form of theosophy—was appealing to the mystic sense, an Asiatic characteristic still latent in many of the Colossian disciples. Other cultural influences entered into the syncretism, especially if we are to accept the common interpretation of Colossians 2:18 as indicating the prevalence of angel worship. But this conclusion we have declined to accept. The thing warned against was an esoteric or mentally ecstatic condition in which the worshipper simulated the worship of angels. This the apostle more definitely describes elsewhere as " will worship," perhaps also synonymous with the term " voluntary humility." The " angels " of the Colossian passage have been identified with the demiurgi of the Gnostics by those critics who have assigned the epistle to a date as late as the second century, a thought fathered by a wish rather than by a healthy argument; for while Gnosticism was potential in the teachings of the age, it had not developed into a distinct idea, as has already been observed. The naked text of Colossians is, we think, sufficiently plain in showing that St. Paul warned simply against Judaistic traditions and the philosophizing tendency of the Greek mind. The first was a settled influence, but the other might present one aspect today and another tomorrow. Indeed, its one concern was either "to tell or to hear some new thing." The vast assumptions of this philosophy, its really "weak and beggarly" output, furnished St. Paul with the occasion for his exalting estimate of Jesus as incarnating the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, as being the head of all principality and power, and the Firstborn of every creature. The wisdom of the Greeks, so long the chief obstacle to the progress of the Gentile mission, was given its last and silencing answer. The Christology of St. Paul emerged in a perfect statement.

A modern contention has fixed upon Cæsarea as the place of the writing of Ephesians and Colossians. The defenders of this theory assume that at Cæsarea St. Paul had opportunity for such prolonged meditations as were necessary to develop the stupendous thought-details of these two messages to the Asiatic churches; but that at Rome, between preaching to such as came to his dwelling and disputing with litigious Judaizers, he was left no such opportunity. The contention is hardly worth an answer, so great are the objections that multiply against it. This would give Philippians a relatively later date, and one subsequent to the writing of the other two letters, which is an irreconcilable difficulty. Besides, the circumstance of Onesimus, or even of Tychicus, being an actor in the attendant drama, cannot be fitted into the Cæsarean theory. But by far the greatest argument for the date and order which we have indicated is found in the writings themselves. St. Paul undoubtedly had long been at work thinking out a philosophy of history. This would have been a natural consequence of his ratiocinations had he journeyed no farther from Judaism than to become a student of Plato, which undoubtedly some time in his life he had been. But when the revelation of Jesus Christ burst on him, and the glory of the Messianic kingdom began to unfold, his mind picked up the central clue of history, thus illumined, and began to follow it, not as a subconscious process, nor yet as a mental movement aside, but as the chief means of compassing the perfect vision of the Gospel.

The Epistle to the Ephesians is the chart of that universe which is the habitat of spiritual men, the race whose genesis is after the power of an endless life. Much has been made of the homologies of Ephesians and Colossians, sometimes to the sinister end, as we have seen, of disparaging one as an enlargement of the other, resulting from the work of a second-century Paulinist. But the likenesses and the variants of these two writings are sufficiently pronounced to establish, on the one hand, the claim of Pauline authorship, and, on the other, independency of origin and particularity of design. In Colossians it appears that the overmastering purpose of St. Paul in that letter is to produce a portrait of the absolute Christ, and in the circumambiencies of that portrait to set the aspects and relationships of redeemed humanity. In like manner, as we shall now seek to show, his purpose in Ephesians was to chart the universe of spiritual realizations—the realm of redeemed human attainment,—and in that universe enthrone the ascended Christ. In this order, Colossians is the greater achievement, and also follows chronologically after Ephesians as the last and crowning of the general writings of the great apostle.

Protagoras, the earliest of the Sophists, is credited with having first announced the doctrine that man is the measure of all values, leaving the judgments and conclusions of men to be themselves the standards of valuation. The teachings of St. Paul in Ephesians establish the premises of this doctrine, but deny the conclusion. His epistle is the true *Homo Mensura*, not only deriving humanity from the workings of an eternal purpose, but referring its destiny to a primary concern of the eternal will, and identifying its racial existence and fortunes with the person and glory of the absolute Christ.

In Colossians we may trace the advance of the mind of St. Paul in the construction of a philosophy of history. This philosophy issued in the finality of Jesus Christ perceived as the absolute fact of history, no less than the absolute thought of God. The statement of that finality is found in the epistle in the characterization of Him as the One "in whom was pleased all fulness to dwell." Only short of this absolute fact fell the lesser fact of humanity conceived of as the exponent of the created universe, in which Christ is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." The statement of this subsidiary doctrine is found in Ephesians. Thus in that letter it is the objective fulness of Jesus Christ which is affirmed, while in Colossians it is the subjective absolute of his fulness which is taught.

The skilful employment of particular words surcharged with dynamical meaning, and the invention of phrases terse and challenging, are methods characteristic of St. Paul in all his writings; but in his last two epistles he surpasses his own record, and forces from written speech the last syllable of possible meaning. Save for the incomparable portrait of Jesus in Colossians, the tone is equally maintained in the two epistles. If the first should stand as the Mount of Transfiguration, endued with clouds of glory, the latter must seem as the pleasant sea-strips of Galilee where the risen Lord breathes upon His chosen the spirit of power and ministry.

In Ephesians the universe of the spiritual race is described in terms that not only exhibit its expanding outlines and its impingements upon the eternal, but also suggest the order of the life and attainment which are to fill up its reaches of space and duration. The general term used in charting this universe is "the heavenlies." It is in the heavenlies that the kingdom of Messiah is constituted; but, contrary to the usual interpretation, "the heavenlies," as described by St. Paul, are not wholly in the far-off, eternal realm, but embrace the present fellowships and activities of spiritual men, while they themselves constitute the assembly of the visible body of Christ in the world. The word "heavenlies," rendered *heavenly places* by the Authorized Version, is used nowhere in the Greek Bible except in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and is itself enough to establish the claim which we make concerning the motif of the epistle as a description of the universe of spiritual men. Five times, indeed, the unique phrase, "in heavenly places," recurs: (1) in 1:3, as the sphere in which spiritual men receive their native and appropriate blessings; (2) in 1:20, as the basilica of Jehovah Himself, where Christ the Anointed Lord is seated "at his own right hand;" (3) in 2:6, where spiritual men, those translated and those remaining in the earthly fellowship, "sit together in Christ Jesus," sharing His power; (4) in 3:10, as the theatre of the study by the angelic orders of "the manifold wisdom of God" as made "known by the church;" (5) in 6:12, as the arena of the conflict of spiritual men "with the rulers of the darkness of this world and against spiritual wickedness."

This gives at a glance a view of St. Paul's conception of the spiritual universe, embracing the all of grace, from the earthly walks of the faithful to the throne and kingdom of Messiah. How different from the aspects of that mechanical universe of successively inclosing, concentric spheres, first conceived of in Assyrian cosmogony, and then exploited by Jewish pseudepigraphists and Christian schoolmen, and to which it has sometimes been falsely charged that St. Paul and other New Testament writers gave adhesion. However much the notion of St. Paul concerning cosmic space may have been lacking in the technique of modern scientific knowledge, to him the universe was illimitable, and the dominion of Christ and His saints ramified it, acknowledging no boundaries and meeting no barriers.

The participation of spiritual men in the activities of the heavenlies is in this epistle declared to be a patrimony—" in whom also we have been made to inherit." But consciously, and with purpose to preserve his faith in the unity of the universe and the heirship of spiritual men, he looks from the Godhood side and sees the divine activity to be " the glory of his inheritance in the saints." Nothing short of a revelation, an inerrant perception of the unity of the heavenlies, could have suggested this reduplication of terms, by which the two aspects of the inheritance are brought into the line of a single vision. Nor less significant is the declaration that this divine aspect of the inheritance, this personal interest in Christ, is a matter of the *seeing of the heart.* Our Authorized Version renders the passage thus: " The eyes of your understanding being enlightened;" but the literal reading would seem to run thus: " Being enlightened the eyes of your hearts." This was the meaning of Jesus when, in His last interview with the disciples before the agony in the garden, He said: "A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father."

The personal consciousness of Jesus fills the universe. Where it touches the lives of spiritual men it becomes reciprocal. Because He lives, we also live.

With this designation of the spiritual universe as the united " heavenlies," and this description of the participation of spiritual men in its activities as an inheritance, we are prepared to consider the further terminologies employed by St. Paul in connection therewith. We shall expect to find a certain logical sequence in the order of the use of these terminologies, and in this will not be mistaken. In the very address of the Ephesian epistle stands the declaration that God from the beginning destined the race of spiritual men to inherit in this universe of the heavenlies: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." How appropriately, at the end of the order of this narrative or account, occurs the declaration that the cycle beginning before the foundation of the world continues forever—" throughout all generations, to the ages of the ages." The unity and fulfilment of this design are declared to be the eternal plan of God, " which he purposed in Christ Jesus " (3:11). Not only is the choosing of these relations from the foundation of the world, but the final conjunction of the chosen order is secured by edict: " having predestined us unto the adoption of sonship." This preordination is not of individual election, as the old creeds so naïvely assumed, but is a predetermination of the conjunction of great dual designs concerning the rise of the spiritual race and the habitat in which that race was to spring, as also its progress toward perfection.

The next step in the apostle's process of delimitation is expressed in the remarkable sentence whose introductory clause is, "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times" . . . The Authorized Version concludes with: "he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on the earth." Faithful as this reading is, it does not deliver the full force of the central word of the passage. The verb, ανακεφαλαιώσασθαι, rendered "gather together in one," has the idea of "heading up;" not an *omnium gatherum*, but a putting together of eternal salients. It is an orator's term, employed to indicate the stage of recapitulation, the binding together of the heads of an argument. It points to the time when, and the act by which, the various orders and attainments of life in the heavenlies are to be assembled into an enduring unity. Dr. Murray, one of the editors of the Cambridge New Testament, gives this terse rendering: "That he might sum up the universe in Christ;" the fine force of which every student of the Greek Testament will recognize. This is according to St. Paul's doctrine, elsewhere set forth, namely, the "reconciling of all things unto himself." It is the charter of that universe the chart of which he had already made.

Naturally enough, follows the conditional statement: "until the redemption of the purchased possession;" meaning that the summing up of the contents of the heavenlies awaits the perfecting of the race of spiritual men. It would seem that instead of "until" as a translation of εἰς it would be more expressive of the idea to say: "the earnest of our inheritance, *leading* *into* the redemption of those who have been acquired and preserved." The idea of continuity, as also that of security, seems to be equally uppermost.

The indivisible content of the *earnest* secured to spiritual men of their participation in the "summing up" of the heavenlies is "the quickening" assumed by our translators in 2:1, and fully expressed in 2:5: "and hath made us alive together with Christ." The philosophy of St. Paul's universe is as logical as it is theological. The inclusions of the heavenlies are not mere matters of decree and foreordination, as the old dogmas would have it, but are the facts of the passionate birth-power of the souls of men and nations. And this is not only power to come to birth, but power to live on, and "into the redemption of those acquired and preserved." With this argument evanishes every excuse for the scholastic tenets of predestination as taught in the middle ages and early Reformation creeds.

Following this conclusive argument, St. Paul finds a place for the consideration of his doctrine of the spiritual equality of Jew and Gentile. It became to him an epitome of that great "summing up of the universe" when spiritual men, both those translated and those in the flesh, shall be brought, with angelic principalities and hierarchies, into the fellowship of "the household of God." This entering in of the Gentiles constitutes a sacrament in the ages of the earthly household, just as the entering of all spiritual men into the highest of the heavenlies is to constitute the sacrament of the ultimate age. Thus in "other ages" it was not made known "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs of the same body," just as in still earlier ages it was not known that God had predestined a mighty spiritual race to inhabit with Him the highest of the heavenlies.

These conclusions, in turn, prepared the way for St. Paul's teaching concerning the Church as the prime integer of the empire of the heavenlies, which immediately succeeded to the arena of consideration, first, in these words: "which is his body the fulness of him that filleth all in all;" but, more latterly, as making known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places "the manifold wisdom of God." The operative end of the Church in the empire of the heavenlies is immediately declared to be to enable the saints to comprehend together "the breadth and length and depth and height" of the content of that empire, which experience is again defined as being "filled with all the fulness of God." Thus is the joint heirship of Christ and the believer affirmed. Christ contains the fulness of the Godhead bodily; the believer cannot contain the fulness, but is filled to overflowing.

The climax of the history of St. Paul's universe is the Ascension of Jesus Christ. He is particular in the affirmation that this ascent was into the ultimate of all spiritual heights: "far above all heavens." The richness and effectiveness of St. Paul's imagery find illustration in the fact that he is able to repeat the climax of his "summing up of the universe" in the use of the ancient formula: "He led into captivity a multitude of captives." Thus he sees the lowest of the heavenlies merged into the highest. The ark has found its rest in the holy of holies, and the redeemed multitudes of earth fill the courts of the temple above.

Nothing now remains to perfect the ideal of St. Paul's universe except the eternal unity, no longer symbolized, but realized. "Till we all arrive at the goal in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect manhood, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Surely the individuality and enduring significance of this great epistle constitute in themselves a claim to canonicity and authority which no manner of criticism can effectively assail. The Holy Scriptures rest equally upon the patriarchs, prophets and apostles.

X

AGES OF THE AGES

THE New Testament phrase, " the ages of the ages," seems to refer to those cycles of duration that lie beyond the centuries of time and the life of the created universe. In them, eternity will restore itself, save for the increment of the " heavenlies,"—" principalities and powers," the " innumerable company of angels " and " the spirits of just men made perfect," headed up of Jesus Christ in the family above. As we interpret the Scriptures, this is the goal of creation, the final stage of redemption. The revelation concerning it is but a glimpse into verity, but is affirmative and reassuring. What activities are to occupy men and angels united into the citizenship of eternity is beyond the guess of mind. To St. Paul, caught up into the third heaven, it was given to hear " unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter," but which again only suggested the transcendence of the immortal state. The Scriptures throughout take cognizance of this state; but only minister an " earnest of the inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Whatever, therefore, the activities of the final state, they can be conceived of only, in the divine large, as ranging the lines of intellectual expansion and annexing the zones of spiritual dominion. This is progress toward the perfection of God, the heraldry of eternal life, the clothing upon of immortality.

The temporal character of the cosmos seems seldom to have impressed the schools of pragmatic science. The fact that there was a time " when nothing was " has never been given major consideration in general scientific discussion; and yet, if properly apprehended, it would arrest the main errors of materialism, and open up a new vista to philosophy. Also, it would lead to a readjustment of the prevailing scientific method in dealing with religion. Those tenets of science regarded as absolutes do but define stages of transition from the eternity that was to the eternity which is to come. But religion being essentially eternal, it follows that its facts and elemental doctrines belong in a category widely separated from those of the material. Incarnation, atonement, resurrection and redemption, together with their revealed record, are of the things that " endure forever." They, therefore, cannot be measured by the plumb-line of material science.

If this principle were accepted, and reverently acted upon, it would cure the crass and coin-matching methods employed by some scientists when they come to assess the supernatural records of the Old and the New Testaments. Also, if the pragmatists could properly interpret the facts of their own science, the definite beginning and the certain destruction of matter, with all that philosophy attributes to it, would be forecast in the very terms which they themselves have invented. Chemical analyses and the law of origins attest the transitory character of material substances. This is a fact which forever stalks through the laboratory, but it is not pushed beyond the letter of chemical test; so that science becomes passionless, mechanic and irresponsive to spiritual challenge. Eternity is but narrowly delimited from every great scientific discovery. However, that to which science is oblivious, namely, the end of the existing cosmic order, the Scriptures are constantly alert. The prophet and the evangelist have made it a fundamental of their challenge.

Except for the idealist and the believer in the pre-existence of matter, this posit of the end of the cosmic age goes without question; but the significance of it seldom has been weighed, even by those whose philosophical predilections are favourable. Little wonder, then, that those who see in materialism the fulness of wisdom and the spring of ultimate forces should be blind to the most august reality of which philosophy can conceive. To such, "a concourse of fortuitous atoms" outrates the creative voice which "spake and it was done; which commanded, and it stood fast."

Before chemistry and geology added their discoveries to the accumulating data of astronomy, men found no point in reason from which to conceive of either the origin of matter, or of its destruction, facts that, from the beginning, were clearly and concisely stated in the revelation made through inspiration. When only the telescope and the calculus dealt with spatial distances and planetary nodes; and when only a rudimentary metallurgy scanned the rocks, the impression conveyed from the face of nature was of always pre-existing and sempiternal matter. This impression became the occasion of sundry misadventures in theology and philosophy, finally resulting in pantheism, which became both philosophy and theology. At various times in the history of thought pantheism has ruled as a cardinal doctrine of belief.

But geology, at length, furnished the means of tracing organic forms, as also the consistency of the rocks themselves, back to rudimentary and inorganic beginnings; while chemistry has pushed the rudimentary back to a cell, to an atom, to a molecule, to an electron, which is next door to extinction; and, indeed, which must be followed by some form of effacement when the onward force of matter becomes a retrograde. This retrograde, when instituted, will spell the return of matter to the conditions whence it originally sprang. This is not announced as a theory from either the religious or philosophical side; though it carries the cogency of relativity and logic. Something akin to it must be written as the finis of the higher speculation.

It is a familiar axiom of science that matter can never be destroyed in fact; that what is commonly thought of as the destruction of matter is only a change in its form, or a combination with other substances, or, at most, a return to constituent elements. One scarcely needs to know the formulas of chemistry to recognize the truth of this. It is little more than a proposition of general experience. The coal in the grate, the water in the steam piston, the melting snows and the disappearing cloud mists, with a thousand other familiar transformations, have made the precedent a plain one. The time has not come for a change in this order, though it has persisted through so vast a time. Cycles and millenniums yet to fulfil only can bring this to pass. The revelation which we seek to interpret deals with the ultimate ages, and with the changes that appertain to them.

We should have to know the chemistry of pre-cosmic matter, if such there was, to understand what might happen under conditions different from those that now exist. This view, though it falls in line with the occult, is neither chimerical, nor fanciful. Science, even today, does not know what is going on in the orbital movements within an atom, not to speak of molecules and electrons. This possibly will provoke a smile from the ultra scientific; but if matter should be conceived of as universally reduced to the condition of electrons, its demise, as before suggested, might be near at hand. The waste of the ages, inevitably, will bring it to that article. The fiat: " Dust to dust," must be matched by that of, " Electron to electron," in the undoing of that which was so gloriously done in its time. It will be with the Creator to reverse the engine of creation at the going in of the final station. A fiat made the worlds; a fiat will unmake them.

Here it is of more than secondary importance to note that the apostle who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews informs us that Scripture knowledge of cosmic origins came of faith. " Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Equally to be appraised is the eschatology of Second

Peter 3:12: “ Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.” This expounds the final cosmic reversal as happening through fire, a position to which science has made belated approach. In this approach, science has used the form, “ burned out,” indicating the incineration of suns and planets; while the apostle employs the differential, “ burned up,” but connoting the same result. The conjunction is illuminating and confirmatory of revealed truth. No literature, other than the Bible, has made so conclusive a call upon the verities which are “ hidden from the ages and generations.”

The more direct the inquiry made into Scripture concerning its anticipations of the discoveries of science, the more surprisingly general and exact these anticipations prove to be. A claim that will bear restatement here may be entered, namely, that the Scriptures represent a most ancient knowledge of both material and spiritual phenomena, a knowledge now non-existant, except as found reported in these same Scriptures. The chief canonical repository of this knowledge is the book of Genesis, upon which the other Bible writers have drawn with conclusive results.

The limits of inquiry marked for this final chapter of our studies do not include the millennial age; but begin with the clearance of the perfected universe from the toils of its once necessary cosmic adjuncts. Nevertheless, it will be profitable here to consult the Scripture references to those augustly predicted events which are generally referred to and treated of as millennial.

Too often, when the millennial prophecies have not had a strained interpretation put upon them, they have been passed by with indifference and incredulity. This is not only unworthy a serious mind; but is also hurtful to the possibilities of Christian experience. For, whatever significance may be ascribed to these millennial predictions, they have a vital bearing on individual and collective Christian destiny. Accruing history will, no doubt, bring a new light to the study of their details. Toward the end of this dispensation, a fuller explication of their phenomena may be given, and in a way not now understood, but in accord with the revelation as we possess it.

There are not wanting great and devout minds who, today, entirely aside from millennial theory, look for overt manifestations before the close of the age. For one, I am inclined to expect, in the very last days of the world's regeneration, a return to the Church of the power to work miracles, a power which certainly was withdrawn at the close of the apostolic age. These miracles would occur in the highest realms of faith, and in accordance with a realized advancement of the race in redemption and grace. Also, I am equally inclined to expect a renewal of angelic visitations to those "who shall be heirs of salvation." After these realizations, it would be but a natural step to the renewed office of prophecy. In all consistency of logic and Scripture, a final and premonitory message awaits expectant Christendom. Indeed, the ancient prophecy includes the spirit of this as a pledge. "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." As the Church passes into the higher perfections of faith, the intimacy between angels and mortals, as also inter-world communication, should become a natural sequence.

But this may be no better than devout speculation, the offspring of a wish which would enter prematurely into that " which is within the vail." The Scriptures are our guarantee that all shall be finished according to the pattern given from the beginning. However, nothing is more certainly taught in the Gospels, as also in the epistles, than that the Lord will come " a second time;" and also that He will come " in glory." But both the Master and St. Paul have warned believers against fixing the hour, or even the day or season, of the return. Here is the place for decision; as also for sanity in faith. Extremes must be discriminated against. Yet those who stress the quaking details of the coming Advent, are more to be envied than those who lightly receive the promise and challenge of the day of return. While the almanac and the multiplication table are poor adjuncts of preparation for this coming, the modernistic bravado which empties the millennial era of its bodily risen Christ and His Messianic reign with the saints is a denial of the faith, and no better than infidelity. The preparation for the coming, as enjoined in the New Testament, is of the normal life of faith and worship.

As the Bodily Resurrection was answer to the Virgin Birth; and as the Ascension was answer to the Resurrection, so the Ascension will be answered in the Second Advent, and in the bodily resurrection of all those who sleep in Christ. No conception ministered through the spirit of revelation can surpass this in glory or in the certitude of its presenting; but it is not possible to attain to an exhaustive knowledge of its divine circumstance; for, whatever interpretation may be worked out on the basis of Bible prediction, it comes, at last, to this, namely, the Lord will suddenly appear, and that as a thief in the night; our Redeemer shall stand upon the earth, and we shall see Him as He is, and that for ourselves. He will then show us what He will do; and from thence we shall be forever in His presence. This, safely and surely, is the millennial pledge. "Even so come, Lord Jesus!"

Beyond the millennial vision come the ages of consummation. Though, as before observed, we can form only happy conjectures concerning the activities of the eternal state, from the Scriptures are deducible informing intimations touching the majesties, titles and fellowships of those who have inherited immortality. The Epistle to the Ephesians, as we have seen, becomes a chart of the spiritual universe, culminating in the ultimate "heavenly," where redeemed men and angels meet in eternal intercourse, and in an eternal mutual appropriation of truth and life.

Not only is the personality of Jesus Christ the inspiration and object of angelic inquiry, in which angels join with men; but it is seen as the cohesive of principalities and powers throughout the ages of the ages. In a passage indicating the personality of Christ as the present and forever continuing objective of faith, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews pushes his discourse into the finalities which we have been discussing

—" Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today, and forever." The differential, " forever," leaves accomplished eternity behind with the " yesterday " and " today " of historic Christology. " Forever " is the correlative of those invisible things of creation which are reserved as the heritage of the unchanging Christ and the multitudes of the redeemed, with the added fellowship of angels. The purpose of creation was to obtain these results.

There was a time when only God was. Nor sun, nor worlds; nor death, nor hell; a time when heaven was not; nor angels; nor depths, nor heights; nor night, nor day—only God and that eternity which is the vestment of His power. But in that eternal yesterday, Jesus Christ the Word was, and was with God, and was God. That was the age of the *Kenosis,* in which the Word, in long anticipations, became self-emptied of His glory, and awaited the humiliation, the temptations and the sufferings of His coming incarnation. As is the rule with other New Testament writers in such connection, St. Paul puts the whole concept of the *Kenosis* into a single brief statement; but it widely illuminates the æons of the beginning, before time was. It accounts for that which was the otherwise unknown antecedent of the written evangel. It was the Gospel before Bethlehem, Galilee, Gethsemane or Golgotha.

When, at the close of the *Kenosis,* or self-emptying of the Son, Jehovah sat alone in the hermitage of unattended majesty, He said: " Let us make man in our image, and after our likeness." Then began that which is called " today " in the apostolic summary. It was the beginning of the long *Now* of time; of creation, of revelation, of the Incarnation, of the regeneration and of the glory of Messiah, culminating in the millennial day. Suns, worlds, civilizations and conquests ensued, holding their constant way, as they shall hold to the end.

The written Scriptures are our sole authority regarding the counsels and motives which set the Creator forth upon His work; as also they alone are our guide in discovering the wisdom and power that are pledged to uphold all things to " the consummation of the ages." These Scriptures explicitly state that the " heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." This is the close of the present age of cosmic existence, physical creation having accomplished its course under the direction of the Creator.

Comes then the dawning of the ages of the ages, when suns shall consume, worlds shall fall into ashes, and the firmaments and seas shall return to primeval non-existence. The confidence with which these things are set forth in the Book is the despair of science and the correction of the wise.

In an earlier chapter of this volume, when the creation of man was under consideration, the thought was ventured that humanity is the expositive of the material universe. This concept, however, can be complete only when it is made to relate to the humanity of Christ. As the God-man, " all things were made by him and for him;" and humanity, above all, was made for His glory; while He, as the Galilean Son of man, was made for humanity. This transfers the whole thought of anthropology from the eternity that was to the eternity that shall be. With this thought of a Christocentric humanity, the Scriptures project themselves into the ages of the ages.

Jehovah Elohim, who created primeval man, realized His "image and likeness" in Jesus the Galilean; in Him the Godhood fulfilled itself. This was the eternal ideal; perfect humanity was the goal of God. The concerns of that perfect humanity have been committed to the Scriptures for record; therefore, the Scriptures must subsist as a testimony to man and his redemption throughout the ages of realization. It was the Word of God whom John saw leading the cavalcade of horsemen through the vistas of the Apocalyptic vision. It is the Word of God who shall lead the Church through the triumphant æons to be. This Word, who is the Godlike Christ, shall complete and perfect a Christlike humanity.

Printed in the United States of America

10:10

BS511 .D81
The Bible and the ages,

Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library

1 1012 00011 2914